

THE EPISCOPAL CONTROVERSY ;
BEING
A SERIES OF LETTERS
WRITTEN BY THE RESPECTIVE FRIENDS OF
THE VEN. ARCHDEACON BETHUNE, D. D.,
AND
DR. CRONYN, RECTOR OF LONDON ;
THE TWO
CANDIDATES FOR THE BISHOPRIC
OF THE
Western Diocese.

PRICE, 1s. 10*½*d.

LONDON, C. W. :
"FREE PRESS" STEAM PRINTING OFFICE,
NORTH STREET.

1857.

WILLIAM H. DODGE

WILLIAM H. DODGE

WILLIAM H. DODGE

A

T

CA

THE EPISCOPAL CONTROVERSY ;

L. KING

A SERIES OF LETTERS

WRITTEN BY THE RESPECTIVE FRIENDS OF

THE VEN. ARCHDEACON BETHUNE, D. D.,

AND

DR. CRONYN, RECTOR OF LONDON ;

THE TWO

CANDIDATES FOR THE BISHOPRIC

OF THE

Western Diocese.

LONDON, C. W. :

"FREE PRESS" STEAM PRINTING OFFICE,

NORTH STREET.

1857.

THE
written
appea
Canada
As th
the A
discus
names
would
Churc

All
and a
in a m
be use

Lor

P R E F A C E.

THE following pages are a compilation of a series of letters which, written by different individuals and at different periods, have lately appeared in the columns of several of the papers through Western Canada, on the subject of the Episcopate of the Western Diocese. As the electoral element has been for the first time introduced into the Anglican Church, it was to be expected that a canvassing and discussion of the qualifications, &c., &c., of the candidates whose names have been before the public as eligible for the high office, would naturally follow—whether for the benefit or otherwise of the Church, remains to be proved.

All these letters have excited great interest amongst the friends and admirers of their respective candidates. A re-perusal of them in a more connected form, before the approaching election, may still be useful towards placing “the right man in the right place.”

London, C. W., June 20, 1857.

T

TO

SIR,

As v
to proc
to info
are act
to act i
of the
upon e
irrespe
honest
thinks
have a

Beli
and lai
the cle
the qua
be sele
deliber
A. N. I
and ha
moting
Venera

1.
ordaine
a perio
the Ca

2.
Placed
which,
respect
activity

3.
the im

THE EPISCOPAL CONTROVERSY.

TO THE CLERGY AND LAY DELEGATES OF THE PROPOSED WESTERN DIOCESE.

SIR,

As we have reason to hope that we shall shortly be called upon to proceed to the election of a Bishop, we deem it not inappropriate to inform you of the course we intend to pursue. In doing so, we are actuated by no desire of dictating to you, or of influencing you to act in opposition to your own judgment; but simply by a sense of the duty which, at this solemn crisis, we believe to be incumbent upon every faithful son of the Church, not only to give his vote irrespective of all personal preferences, in accordance with his honest convictions, but also to speak a word of counsel, when he thinks it may tend to the good of that holy cause which we all have at heart.

Believing it to be the wish of a decided majority of the clergy and laity, that our future Bishop should be selected from among the clergy of Canada, we have anxiously and impartially considered the qualifications of all, whom we thought to possess any claims to be selected for so high and responsible an office. After mature deliberation we have resolved to give our support to the Venerable A. N. BETHUNE, D. D., Archdeacon of York, and Rector of Cobourg, and have formed ourselves into a Committee for the purpose of promoting his election. The following, we conceive, are among the Venerable Archdeacon's claims:

1. His long and zealous services. A Canadian by birth, and ordained in this Province, his whole ministerial life extending over a period of thirty-three years, has been devoted to the service of the Canadian Church.

2. His earnest performance of the duties of a Parish Priest. Placed in an important and extensive sphere of duty, the success which, by God's blessing, has attended his ministrations, and the respect and attachment of his flock, are the best proofs of his activity and faithfulness.

3. His experience. Selected by the Bishop of the Diocese for the important office of Archdeacon, he has enjoyed ample facilities

for becoming acquainted with the wants of the country, and especially of this western portion of it, which has been included in his Archdeaconry.

4. His long official connection with the proposed new Diocese. Maintained as this has been, we believe, to the satisfaction of all the clergy, it gives him a peculiar claim to the elevation we desire for him. To overlook one connected with us so closely, and in the highest position which he could hold next to the Episcopate itself, would appear like a want of confidence, and be an indirect imputation upon the wisdom and judgment of our revered Diocesan who selected him for that position.

5. The oneness of sentiment between him and our present Bishop. There are certain interests and institutions,—our Church Society, our College, the future appropriation or division of the Fund arising from the Commutation of the Stipends of the Clergy,—which will be for a long time common to all the Dioceses in Upper Canada, and in the maintenance and management of these, it is of the highest importance that there be perfect unity and harmony of sentiment between the overseers of each.

6. His theological attainments. As the Head of an Institution for training theological students, as a writer and as a preacher, he has given evidence of solid and extensive theological learning, united with great felicity of expression. The degree of Doctor of Divinity has been conferred upon him by two distinguished colleges in acknowledgment of these acquirements.

7. His knowledge and habits of business. The offices which he has filled as Archdeacon, as Chaplain to the Bishop, and as Vice-President of the Diocesan Church Society, have caused many details of the Episcopal administration of this extensive Diocese to devolve upon him; and he is favorably known for the administrative tact, the punctuality, discretion, and sound judgment which he has brought to bear upon every matter that has been entrusted to him.

8. His sound yet moderate views in regard to the doctrine and discipline of the Church. While we avow that one of his chief recommendations to us is his steady adherence to the sound principles which we believe to be those of the Bible, and its best interpreter, the Book of Common Prayer, he has ever enunciated these in a conciliatory and moderate tone. And we cannot doubt that, as our Bishop, he would be the father and friend of all, and not of any party, and would act towards all his clergy with perfect impartiality and toleration, proving in this respect a worthy successor to our present beloved Diocesan.

There are other points of which we might speak; but as they involve qualities without the possession of which we cannot con-

ceive them
not nec-
men-
the min-
love for
his own

In ce-
are mad-
seriously-
not with-
will gu-

REV. A.

have “
of the A-
Diocese,
I hereby
have add-
fair and
doing so
of that
account
have w-
taken, a
insuffici-
generall
invidiou
of our
dealing

ceive that any man would be named for the office of a Bishop, it is not necessary that we should dwell upon them. We may however mention that the Venerable Archdeacon has two sons preparing for the ministry, a rare occurrence in Canada; at once testifying his love for the Church, and proving that he is "one that ruleth well his own house."

In conclusion, we invite you to receive these remarks, as they are made, in a fair and Christian spirit; to weigh them well and seriously; and to act upon them as your conscience may lead you, not without prayer to the Almighty Head of the Church that he will guide you and direct your choice.

We have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your faithful servants and brethren in Christ,

ABRAHAM NELLES, *Missionary to the Grand River Indians.*

FREDERICK MACK, *Rector of Amherstburg.*

ADAM TOWNLEY, *Incumbent of Paris.*

J. G. R. SALTER, B.A., *Incumbent of Sarnia.*

EDWARD H. DEWAR, M.A., *Rector of Sandwich,* Secretary.

TO THE REV. ABRAHAM NELLES.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—

As your name stands first on the list of five clergymen, who have "formed themselves into a committee" to promote the election of the Archdeacon of York to the bishopric of the proposed Western Diocese, I take the liberty to address to you the few observations which I hereby submit. I have read the address issued by the committee, and have adopted the suggestion to "receive your remarks," I hope, "in a fair and christian spirit, and weigh them well and seriously." In doing so, the conclusion at which I have arrived is the very opposite of that which, I presume, you would have desired; and if, in accounting for this result, I trench upon the delicacy which I could have wished to observe, I must plead in excuse the initiative taken, and the precedent furnished by Dr. Bethune's friends. An insufficient apology, no doubt more especially as I believe it was generally understood by the clergy that personal reflections and invidious comparisons were carefully to be avoided in the election of our bishop. From such a course some of your colleagues, in dealing with their brethren, have fearfully departed. In an

unsparing measure they have disparaged some, and no less copiously have they panegyrised others. I must study a more modified course, in entering upon a discussion which these proceedings and your late address have forced upon me. With respect to the address, its strains are in a tone marvellously changed and adroitly chastened. So far I hail the improvement, but I no less dissent from its specious pleadings. To discuss them *seriatim* would be tedious, but you will bear with me, I hope, while I review for a little, some of the statements which have been advanced, a task I never should have undertaken, had not your friends, aggressively, and as if in defiance, invited the scrutiny. The first plea in favor of Dr. Bethune is, "his long and active services," a pretension surely which also pertains to many of his brethren. The next, is an appeal to nationality. That is to say, the Revd. Messrs. Townley, Salter, Dewar, three Englishmen, and Revd. Mr. Mack, an Irishman, forsooth plead the superior pretensions of Dr. Bethune, because born in Canada, ordained in Canada, and am I wrong in saying, of Scotch parentage. Surely these gentlemen calculate largely on the credulity of "the clergy and lay delegates!" this circumstance, moreover, taken in connexion with the fact that these gentlemen, not very long since, pressed as ardently upon the notice of this diocese, the names of two clergymen, one after the other, both of whom were born, ordained, and resident in the old country. They further argued that, "to elect one of her distinguished sons as our first bishop, would be a graceful act towards our mother church." I desire not to depreciate Canadians; my sons are Canadian born, and the first principle I inculcate on them, as regards citizenship, is not that they were born here, or born there, but that they stand in a world of men, and by the providence of God, under the British flag, to win their way under the divine blessing, as Anglo-Saxons. Permit me now, sir, for brevity sake, to be a little categorical on some of the points contained in the address.

1. The Archdeacon's "performance of the duties of a parish priest."
2. His position as head of "the institution for training theological students."
3. "His degree of Doctor of Divinity."
4. "His theology."
5. His pretensions to the episcopate, "because he is at present the Archdeacon."
6. "His acquaintance with the wants of the country, especially this western portion of it."
7. "The oneness of sentiment between him and our present Bishop."
8. "His connexion with the Church Society, college, the future appropriation or division of the funds arising from the commutation of the stipends of the clergy, &c." You lay stress on the "importance of unity and harmony of sentiment," in relation to these things, "between our future overseers." Suffer a few questions on these

heads. I trust I shall confine myself to matters of fact, and to things involved in the address which the "clergy and lay delegates" are so confidently invited "to weigh well and seriously."

1. What induced the violence which led indignant parties to destroy the imagery erected on an altar in Dr. Bethune's new church in Cobourg? 2. What occasioned the severance of three theological students from the training institution at Cobourg?—Young men who are now exercising their ministry in the church, one in this new diocese, the other two in places of high ecclesiastical trust in England. Was not their separation from Cobourg caused by the inculcation of tenets which they could not conscientiously receive? 3. What "distinguished colleges" conferred on the Archdeacon the degree of D. D., "in acknowledgement of his acquirements?" Was it Oxford, Cambridge, Trinity College, Dublin, or any principal university in Europe? 4. The Archdeacon's "theology," what explanation do the committee give of his published and oft expressed palliations of the teachings of Dr. Pusey, "the Tracts for the Times" and tractarians, who have long since gone to Rome? What of his vindications of the celebrated sermon of Dr. Pusey, on account of which that personage was suspended from preaching in Oxford University? Are not these things to be weighed? Why have they been omitted in the address? Has it been from an apprehension that they might prejudice the efforts for Dr. Bethune's elevation. 5. Does his position as Archdeacon give him "a peculiar claim," and establish as a sequence his right to be our new bishop? What occasion then for an election? The approaching proceeding becomes a mockery! 6. "His acquaintance with the wants of this country, especially this western portion of it." True, he has been Archdeacon for about fifteen or sixteen years; will the committee obligingly state how many weeks during that period he has passed in these western parts? He has visited some of our principal towns three or four times, and has less frequently journeyed through the rural parts. He has by circulars called upon clergymen and churchwardens from distances of sixty miles to attend his visitations, but has this given him "especial acquaintance with these western parts." If a few weeks intercourse with us has given to the Archdeacon such a "special acquaintance with our wants," what must not an abiding residence of twenty-five years, within the limits of the new diocese, have yielded to the other candidate, known as a man of no ordinary powers of perception, of acknowledged talents, intrusted with an official position by his bishop, nevertheless, now opposed by some in a fruitless effort to acquire a precedence for Dr. Bethune a comparative stranger to us. You will pardon I hope, my plainness,

and excuse me in being thus seemingly harsh, in addressing myself to a brother whom I sincerely respect. 7. "The oneness of sentiment between the Archdeacon and our present Bishop." Does your committee mean to say that the Archdeacon's mind merges in the sentiments of the Right Revd. Dr. Strachan? Or do they mean by "oneness" like character of mind and sentiments? If the latter, I am persuaded Dr. Bethune himself would have told them, that the comparison would have been as just, and the identity as real, had they compared a respectable, requisite officer in the admiralty, to the dauntless hero who commands a fleet. Dr. Bethune is a clergymen of respectable acquirements, but he is not Dr. Strachan. 8. "Certain interests and institutions, the Church Society &c., the appropriation or division of the funds arising from the commutation of the stipends of the clergy"—these things you state will be for a long time common to all the diocese in Upper Canada, "and in the management of these, perfect unity and harmony between the overseers, will be of the highest importance." Do the committee desire to plead for centralization, and tendencies of this kind as recommendatory of the Archdeacon. If so, I think the five gentlemen will find a very cold response to their canvass in the west. In conclusion if you consider the Archdeacon's elevation to the episcopate of so much importance, is he not, and has he not been for many years, resident in the new diocese of the east. Why not leave to him the honour of being elected for that See? Why not continue the benefit of his services to the members of the church amongst whom he has so long lived? Is it a favour to them or an obligation due to us, to translate him to London? Your first plea was an appeal on local grounds, why not be consistent with your reasoning, and say an eastern for the east, and a western for the west. Dear Sir, the pleadings of the address are fallacious, and I have full confidence they will be so regarded by "*The Clergy and Lay Delegates of the proposed Western Diocese.*" An unpleasant task has been forced upon me, I have acquitted myself to it but briefly and imperfectly, and my unwillingness to engage in a controversy of the kind may be seen from my slowness in entering into it, influenced partly by a sense of my comparatively unimportant position, but more especially by the impression I was under, as already alluded to, and my concurrence in the principle, that disputatious canvassing, and in particular, reproaches and recriminations amongst the clergy, were carefully to be avoided in the election of our bishop.

I am, Revd. and Dear Sir.

Yours faithfully,

April 29th, 1857.

CHAS. C. BROUGH.

THE REV. C. C. BROUGH AGAINST THE VENERABLE
A. N. BETHUNE, D. D.

To the Clergy and Lay Delegates of the proposed Western Diocese.
MY DEAR BRETHREN :

The Rev. C. C. Brough having addressed a letter to the Rev. A. Nelles, which I have reason to think has been widely circulated, but which I only saw for the first time last evening, I beg your attention to some remarks which I have been strongly urged to make in reply.

I shall speak plainly, because I feel strongly, the vital importance to the interests of the Church of Christ which are at issue ; nor do I wish to learn from any man to disgrace the blessed honesty of the Gospel by using honied words to disguise a stab under the fifth rib of my brethren ; but yet, God being my helper, I will endeavour to depart as little in what I shall say, from the sincere love of my brother, as from the truthful defence of the principles of Evangelical Truth. I regret, however, that in answering Mr. Brough I shall be compelled to convict him of *very singular inaccuracies*, and, what appears to me at least, *very disingenuous* treatment of one of the Fathers of our Israel.

I shall in the plainest and simplest manner endeavour to follow Mr. Brough, *seriatim*.

1. He charges Dr. Bethune's supporters with having been the first to introduce "personalities." Now if this be done with the courtesy and *truthfulness* becoming gentlemen and Christians, I blame no one for doing so, in the all-important matter of choosing a Bishop. It frequently happens that it is the very personal characteristics, infirmities or shortcomings of an individual that render him unfit for that awfully important office. Now, true hearted love to the Church of God, yea, and enlightened love to our brother also, in preventing him from improperly, and unhappily for himself, intruding into an office for which he may be altogether unfit, will compel the faithful and fearless Christian to oppose even these personal deficiencies.

But, my brethren, Mr. Brough's memory must have played him singularly false, if he does not recollect that years ago personalities, *the style of which was disgraceful*, were commenced by those holding Mr. Brough's sentiments against Dr. Bethune, when he was first spoken of as the Bishop of the Eastern Diocese, so that the *onus* of commencing these personalities, and the *sin* of commencing them, most oppressively rests, *not with us*, as Mr. B. asserts, but with his own friends !

ng myself
of senti-
" Does
erges in
do they
? If the
old them,
entity as
the admini-
Bethune
not Dr.
Church
ing from
nings you
in Upper
unity and
ortance."
endencies
o, I think
eanvass in
elevation
as he not
st. Why
Why not
e church
em or an
first plea
with your
n for the
us, and I
he Clergy
An un-
ed myself
o engage
owness in
paratively
ion I was
principle,
ches and
voided in

OUGH.

But, strange to say, that in the present discussions, also respecting the Western Bishop, personalities, and again I regret to have to remark that they were offensive and unjust, and therefore unchristian personalities,—commenced not with us, but with Dr. Cronyn's supporters. I wrote an article in the Simcoe *Standard*, stating, among other things, the sort of man we ought *not* to elect for our future Bishop, but with the utmost care avoiding the remotest personal references, my remarks being as general as the Ten Commandments themselves, which, however, I admit, become terribly personal to those who break them; but in *no other way*, manner or degree was I personal. Well, the Rev. Messrs. Evans and Caulfield saw fit to come out and apply these *general* remarks personally to the Rector of London, and to assail me *personally* for having made them. With these gentlemen, therefore, commenced the personalities of the present contest, as every unprejudiced individual who has read the controversy knows; and now it is followed up by a loose and, therefore, most unfair *personal* attack upon the Archdeacon by Mr. Brough himself! And yet he has so far forgotten himself as most untruly to charge us with having commenced personalities!

2. The men of "the Prayer-Book, the whole Prayer-Book and *nothing but* the Prayer-Book," as the soundest expositor of Holy Writ in existence, never stirred in the matter of the Western Bishopric, until Dr. Cronyn's "national," (I learn the phrase from Mr. Brough,) Irish and Calvinistic supporters, had so far succeeded in their canvassing here, and at home, that Dr. Cronyn's *name appeared in the Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette, as the Bishop elect of London, C. W.!!* And I am told, upon respectable authority, whether correctly or not I cannot state, that had it not been for the sudden death of the *sceptical* Sir Wm. Molesworth, at that time Colonial Secretary, that Reverend Gentleman would immediately have been consecrated Bishop, without so much as deigning to consult the clergy and laity of the new diocese!

3. We are twitted with having first endeavoured to obtain a Bishop from home. We readily acknowledge the charge; though I think our friend Mr. Brough, must have blushed crimson, at his own gross inconsistency in making it. We never asked the Archdeacon to allow himself to be put in nomination, and then upon some affront forsook him, and tried to get a man from home, and when disappointed in this, then returned to our first love! Did not Mr. Brough and others do this with respect to Dr. Cronyn and Mr. McGhee? until we really felt ashamed that any of our clerical brethren could have so acted.

I need not to recapitulate our motives in seeking a Bishop from

home,
nor ca
happy
good.
on the
Bethu
among
him.

4.
of ha
ties in
claim-
cess!
and w
presun
Irish C
I dare
for my
tary, w
whose
this, “
turning
status
he was
young
Archde
divine,
official,
though
country
friends
perseve
stamp
for our
knowle
in thes
sed by

Pard
some, t
attemp
Irish, w
Calvin
the du
get ang

so respect-
eret to have
erefore un-
s with Dr.
Standard,
not to elect
ng the re-
as the Ten
come terri-
y, manner
s and Caul-
 personally
for having
nenced the
iced indivi-
is followed
k upon the
s so far for-
commenced

Prayer-Book
xpositor of
he Western
phrase from
r succeeded
hyn's name
shop elect of
e authority,
een for the
t that time
mmediately
deigning to

to obtain a
ge ; though
nson, at his
the Arch-
then upon
home, and
love ! Did
Cronyn and
our clerical
Bishop from

home; they are before the Church, nor are we ashamed of them, nor can we be charged with whiffling in our conduct. And we are happy in having, we believe, the whole Canadian Press, quite as good judges we opine, as Sir Wm. Molesworth, that has yet spoken on the subject, approve our judgment in selecting Archdeacon Bethune, as being beyond reasonable controversy, the fittest man amongst ourselves for the high office to which we seek to elevate him.

4. But Dr. Bethune is guilty of being a Canadian born, and of having been distinguished by *honorary* degrees from Universities in the United States and in Scotland, to which he had no claim—except unusual ability, unwearied labours, and marked success ! For let Mr. Brough disguise it as he will, this is the sneer, and we, three Englishmen and one Irishman, share in the sneer for presuming to put a Canadian Archdeacon in competition with an Irish Clergyman and a D.D. of Trinity College, Dublin ! Really I dare say we ought to be very much ashamed of ourselves, but, for my life I cannot help remembering the story of the high dignitary, who, when scornfully reminded of his low origin by a man whose birth was his only honour, replied in some such language as this, “Had your lordship been born poor you would have been turning the sod yet.” So might it have been with the literary status of the Archdeacon’s opponents had they been surrounded as he was with the scholastic difficulties which are unavoidable in a young country. It is therefore the position to which the Venerable Archdeacon has raised himself as a scholar, a sound, well read divine, a successful parish priest, and a distinguished diocesan official, so far beyond even many Trinity College D.D.’s., and that, though a gentleman born, under the peculiar difficulties of a new country, which in the estimation of many of his simple-minded friends, proved him to be a man of such energy of character, such persevering effort, and such earnest conscientious labour, as to stamp him beyond all others, amongst ourselves, as the fittest man for our Bishop ; especially seeing that in other points, as experience, knowledge of the working of the Church, her peculiar difficulties in these days, &c., it is not saying much, to say that he is surpassed by no Anglo, or even Irish Canadian Clergyman of the West.

Pardon me, if I have seemed here to indulge, what may seem to some, too light a spirit in so momentous a subject, but really this attempt to trample Canadian, American, Scotch, English, and even Irish, when it ventures to depart from Trinity College, Dublin, Calvinistic cliqueism, literary honor and social respectability into the dust, is so outrageous that were I to treat it seriously, I might get angry.

5. Mr. Brough asks what led to the destruction of the "imagery" on the altar in Cobourg? Oh, Mr. Brough, Mr. Brough, why use such a word? It excites suspicion of an attempt to throw dust in the eyes of simple people, that I do not like to entertain!

Would my readers suppose from the use of such a term, that the "altar" in question was a simple wooden structure from Troy, N.Y., with mere *emblems* of the Crucifixion, as the ladder, nails, &c., with nothing whatever approaching to figures, screwed upon it? The parties giving the Altar-table, who were not I believe, original residents there, wished to have it of *stone*; this, the Archdeacon, as a consistent son of the Church, *absolutely refused*. He *did not see the plans of the table*, but when it came, thought it too *harmless*, as I believe any one of sound mind would have done, to object to. But alas for human motive, I am told that the secret of the opposition lay in female spite! some lady, so called, wishing to avenge an old grudge on the donor, prevailed on her husband to get some young men to creep into the church at night and *conscientiously* mutilated the Holy Table! This I have from a gentleman well acquainted with Cobourg, though living far away from it; and I believe it, not only because I respect the person who told me, but because no really conscientious people, unless they were indeed "west brethren" could ever take offence at so intensely harmless a piece of furniture; or, if it were possible that they did so, they would have taken holier methods of satisfying their consciences than by breaking into a church at night, and defiling God's holy table and temple!

6. But, "what occasioned the severance of three theological students from Cobourg?" asks Mr. B. Not, certainly, as he would insinuate, their theological sentiments, inconsistent as they undoubtedly were with a truthful and literal interpretation of the Prayer-book; but that insubordinate interference with Dr. Bethune in his own parish, and that personal rudeness into which, as is so often the case, their self-righteous errors and their youthful self-conceit led them! I have never spoken to the Archdeacon on the subject, and was not there any more than Mr. Brough; but, from all I have heard, I believe this to be the fact of the case; and so must Mr. Brough, or he blows hot and cold upon our present revered Diocesan, with the same breath. The Bishop was the head of the Theological Institution; and does even Mr. B. believe that he would suffer these young men to be turned away from Cobourg, however deeply they might have drank in the errors of Calvanism, so long as he retained a curate pre-eminently noted for the same? If he would, methinks his lordship would little deserve the laudations which Mr. Brough gives him in the letter under consideration. It

is inde
so ear
insinu

7. " for the
to the
the fir
Gospel
Churc
Purita
vinistic
the va
practic
the ble
every 1
called
out of
themse
doctrin
upon th
Prayer
tryin
own Pr
began t
and up
the Arc
here, re
rians!
they de
one hou

Now,
conduct
against
such ch
errors o
the Pra
porters
and Gen

The r
trifing,
upon yo

8. H
has " p
our pre

e "imagery" high, why use throw dust in in !

term, that the in Troy, N.Y., bills, &c., with upon it ? The original resi- chdeacon, as a he did not see too harmless, to object to. of the oppo- ing to avenge l to get some conscientiously ntleman well om it; and I told me, but were indeed ly harmless a y did so, they r consciences g God's h

heological stu- as he would they undoubt- f the Prayer- Bethune in his as is so often al self-conceit on the subject, rom all I have so must Mr. evered Dioce- l of the Theo- that he would burg, however nism, so long same ? If he he laudations deration. It

is indeed pitiable to see a clergyman of Mr. Brough's respectability so carried away by party feeling as to lend himself to such clap-trap insinuations as those we find in his letter. But another follows.

7. "What do we say to Dr. Bethune's defence of the Tracts for for the 'Times, &c. ?'" Simply this, that he must have been a traitor to the church not to have rejoiced to see the vigorous defence which the first numbers of those Tracts made of the doctrines of the Gospel as ever taught in the Primitive and Reformed Anglican Church. The Church of England had been, ever since the great Puritan Rebellion, more or less afflicted with the incubus of Calvinistic error; awfully dishonoring God by teaching that he formed the vast majority of the human race to be inevitably damned; practically trampling upon the blood of Christ and contradicting the blessed Gospel, by holding that he did not "taste death for every man," but only for a secret number, by Calvinists falsely called the "elect." Calvinism had also done much to drive Christ out of His own Church, by treating the ordinances instituted by themselves as "beggarly elements," these and many other false doctrines and sore practical evils had this deadly error brought upon the church; hence every true believer in the teaching of the Prayer-book rejoiced to see earnest and learned men at Oxford trying once more to reform the Church, and bring her back to her own Prayer-book again;—but when some of these Tract writers began themselves to wander from the pure simplicity of the Gospel and uphold many of the dangerous errors of Romanism; THEN, the Archdeacon, with other sound Churchmen, both at home and here, refused any longer to have anything to do with the Tractarians ! Thus did Dr. Bethune defend the "Tracts" so long as they defended the doctrines of the Church of England, but not one hour longer !

Now, my brethren, it is not strange that such plain and scriptural conduct and such holy wisdom as this should be brought as a charge against the Archdeacon? Does it not look as if those who bring such charges do themselves cling to the unscriptural and dangerous errors of Calvinism, opposed as they are to the plain teaching of the Prayer-book; and are angry with Dr. Bethune and his supporters that they will not do the same, but depart alike from Rome and Geneva ?

The residue of Mr. Brough's circular is little else than solemn trifling, and will not require that I should trespass much longer upon your patience in answering it.

8. He next objects, however, to our stating that the Archdeacon has "peculiar claims" to the Episcopate from being the man whom our present Bishop has ever "delighted to honor." Why, my

brethren, Mr. Brough speaks in that very letter in the strongest terms of the Bishop of Toronto, as a man of master mind! Is it very strange, then, that we should be disposed to pay high respect to his judgment. I suppose I may, without offence, adopt Mr. Brough's words and say, Mr. Brough, Dr. Cronyn, Mr. Evans, &c., are all clergymen of respectable acquirements, but they are not Dr. Strachans!" Well then, I repeat, does it strike you, any thing remarkable, that, with all possible respect for those gentlemen, we should yet ourselves pay greater deference to the opinion of Bishop Strachan, and advise others to do the same, in the election of our future Bishop, than to theirs?

9. But Archdeacon Bethune is "a comparative stranger to us," says Mr. Brough! Alack-a-day to what strange shifts even sensible men are driven, when they throw their reason at the feet of their prejudices! Dr. Bethune is a born Canadian, socially, educationally, clerically trained in the Diocese of Toronto, never having lived twelve months out of it,—residing at various times in three or four different sections of the Diocese; Archdeacon for some fifteen or sixteen years of the West, and going not only from town to town, but from bush to bush and from shanty to shanty, where I have myself had the honor of accompanying him; in constant intercourse officially also with the clergy and laity of the West,—but yet he does not know, says Mr. Brough, so much of our wants and circumstances, either as Canadians or Canadian churchmen, as his Irish Clerical Brother, who for some two-or-three-and-twenty years has been the rector of the flourishing City of London, C.W. Why, Sirs, our Trinity College Dublin friends must calculate a good deal on our simplicity, when they hazard such assertions as this. But, though, no doubt, most unfortunately for ourselves,—we have, few of us shared their inestimable privileges as Dublin University magnates,—albeit "humility" never formed, I should imagine, the subject of one of their prize essays,—still Canadians, whether by adoption or birth, do than heaven, retain mother-wit sufficient not to believe that an easy-going Irish gentleman, of comparatively recent importation, has a more intimate acquaintance with the wants and peculiarities, whether religious or social, of Canada, than a native born gentleman of high position, earnest study, and indefatigable labour!

10. But the supporters of the Archdeacon are charged with "pleading for centralization!" I suppose this is some ugly sin; but what it means as regards the Canadian Church, I cannot pretend to say. I only know that at the time our address was written all our Church property was in the hands of the Church Society of the Diocese of Toronto, and was likely so to remain for some time,

as we
it, the
had al
questi
As, fo
wester
sentim
would
And t
such i
Thus
see on
like co
pected

11.

wester
rowing
Bethu
West!

12.

princip
and fr
of our
pedien
our de
divine

Par

THE

Wha
poor m
for the
a percu
proper
Nelles,
who h

the strongest
r mind ! Is it
y high respect
ce, adopt Mr.
r. Evans, &c.,
ey are not Dr.
ou, any thing
gentlemen, we
nion of Bishop
election of our
ranger to us,"
s even sensible
e feet of their
lly, education-
er having lived
n three or four
ome fifteen or
town to town,
where I have
ant intercourse
t,—but yet he
wants and cir-
rchmen, as his
d-twenty years
n, C.W. Why,
ite a good deal
as this. But,
—we have, few
lin University
d imagine, the
s, whether by
it sufficient not
mparatively re-
with the wants
a, than a native
d indefatigable

as we had then no immediate prospect of legal synods, we deemed it, therefore, an advantage to have a person for our Bishop who had always worked harmoniously with our present Diocese, on such questions; which has not been the case with all our leading clergy. As, for instance, I myself, some years ago, heard a prominent western clergyman, Dr. Cronyn standing by, express the following sentiment: "that if the Bishop did not increase the salaries there would be such a blaze made in the Province as had never been seen!" And this, though it was urged by myself, that the consequence of such increase, must be the destitution of the back settlements.—Thus you see, brethren, it is not without reason that we wish to see one elected for our Bishop, who will have similar views and a like consideration for the poorer missions, with our present respected Bishop, in the future disposal of the Church's funds.

11. Mr. Brough makes a foolish distinction between eastern and western clergy in the matter of choosing our Bishop. This is narrowing our liberty of choice with a vengeance; but were it so, Dr. Bethune's relations, as Archdeacon of York are altogether with the West!

12. Finally, if the Prayer-book is to be our guide as to the principles of our Bishop, talent, theological learning, earnest labour, and freedom from wordly pursuits, the personal recommendations of our Bishop then though we have resorted to no questionable expedients, no disgraceful and most unconstitutional pledging of our delegates—the Venerable Archdeacon Bethune, will, under the divine blessing, be our future Bishop.

I remain,

Your faithful Brother,

ADAM TOWNLEY.

Paris, C. W., May 9, 1857.

THE NEW BISHOP ! WHO SHOULD NOT BE CHOSEN ?

To the Editor of the London Free Press.

What a strange, inconsistent, and changeable set of beings we poor miserable mortals are, how soon we forget the past and dream for the future, are the ideas which come uppermost in my mind, on a perusal of the letter which the Rev. Mr. Brough has thought proper, in the columns of the *Prototype*, to address to Rev. Mr. Nelles, because his name stands first on the list of five clergymen, who have dared to wish "the opposite to what he would have

charged with
ome ugly sin;
I cannot pre-
ess was written
urch Society of
for some time,

desired," and to have formed themselves into a committee in order to promote the election of the Archdeacon of York to the Bishopric of the proposed Western Diocese.

Any unprejudiced mind, looking from a disinterested and neutral point of view at the approaching duel between these rival clergymen, may readily and at once see how egotistical and biased are all his arguments, and what a want of a "*fair and christian spirit*" seems to influence the tone of the whole of the Rev. gentleman's letter. Could it be possible that "*the other candidate known, according to Mr. Brough, as a man of no ordinary perception, of acknowledged talents and intrusted with an official position by this diocesan*," did I say, could it be probable that this immaculate being stood at the Rev. author's, elbow when he was penning his crushing, and, as he fancies, unanswerable questions? Most assuredly, the composition and style of the remarks, partake more strongly of the fruits of those extraordinary powers of perception, than of the emanations of his less gifted friend.

Is it modesty, a conscientious inability, or an impossibility to do so, which have prevented the Rev. author from drawing a comparison between the virtuous merits of his "*favorite candidate*," and the supposed unqualifications of the Archdeacon? Surely *he must calculate largely on the credulity of the "clergy and lay delegates of the proposed Western Diocese*"; surely, some allusions might have been made, or some reasons given why they are to follow the *ipse dixit* of the Rev. Mr. Brough. If an unpleasant and a disagreeable task, *viz* : the exposition of the doctrinal failings of Dr. Bethune, has been forced on him, by what he terms, an aggressive and *quasi defiant* scrutiny, why does he not undertake and perform that task, which must be truly delightful and agreeable to him—*viz* : the drawing of as faithful a delineation of the merits of his *favorite* as he has the faults of his rival? How is it that he has neglected to mention the excellent mode of pastoral visiting, which has characterized for the last 25 years the ministry of the "*other candidate*?" Why does he not enumerate the virtues he has adorned and the numerous tokens of affection and friendship continually shown and felt towards him, by the majority of his admiring parishioners?

Why does he not explain to the world, how all these means have succeeded in combatting and restraining the influence of dissent so rife amongst us? Why does he not show that the episcopal church of London has been enriched at the expense of his model?

Why does he not tell us that the "*other candidate*" possesses that meek, gentle, forgiving, conciliatory and controllable temper, which we all would look forward to, as a requisite in him who is to reign over the future destinies of the Western Diocese?

Ho
all qu
and s
accus

WI
that I
strang
crowd
are n
speed
candi
ones"

The
dulity
are to
depict
marka

I sh
it wou
ments

The
tone o
adroitl

The
" long
stating
his br
the "
activit
have
driven
not tha
filled w

Is it
in Lon
their h
at his
staunch
the cot
cient n
sary an
well at
activity
Bethun

How is it that he makes no mention of that total abstinence from all questionable money operations, that absence of buying, selling, and speculating, which those who know him best would be sorry to accuse him of?

Why does he not for the benefit of the delegates, assure them, that his teachings and exhortations are so much thought of that a stranger would find it almost impossible to obtain a seat, so densely crowded are the benches during his weekly lectures? Why, I say are not these virtues mentioned, which if they existed, would speedily weigh to the ground the "*moral attributes*" of the "*other candidate*," when placed in the same scale with the "*religious ones*" of the Archdeacon of York?

The Rev. gentleman must indeed calculate largely on the credulity of the "*clergy and lay delegates*," if he thinks that they are to understand by hypotheses, that the moral and clerical virtues depicted above, are possessed by his "*favourite candidate*." His marked silence on the subject, would lead us to suppose he did.

I shall follow the author's example, and not discuss *seriatim*, as it would be tedious, but will review for a little, some of the statements which he has advanced and the questions he has asked.

The Rev. gentleman, with an attempt at irony, ridicules the tone of the address he alludes to, as marvellously changed and adroitly chastened.

The first plea in favour of Dr. Bethune, which he attacks, is his "*long and active service*," yet now does he answer it? By merely stating that it was a pretension which also pertained to many of his brethren. May I ask, among the many who can testify as to the "*length*," how many can bear honorable testimony to the *activity* of the services of the "*other candidate*?" How many have not apathy, hauteur, indifference, neglect, estranged and driven from the ranks of Episcopacy into those of Dissent? Is not that stately building, known in London as the Wesleyan Church, filled with many such?

Is it not a fact that there are many, both rich and poor, residing in London, who regularly go to church, but never see a minister in their house from one year's end to another? Is it not a fact, that at his weekly lecture, that some of his warmest admirers and staunchest supporters are rarely, if ever, seen there? Where are the cottage teachings, so necessary a part in the duties of an efficient minister of the Gospel? Where is the extra curate so necessary and the payment of whose professional services could be so well afforded? Echo answers where? In what then does this activity, which we are told pertains to many as well as to Dr. Bethune consist? Is it, in going into other parishes preaching a

flowery discourse, and performing the official task, imposed upon him by his Diocesan.

The next plea which our Rev. friend visits with his wrath is, what he terms an *appeal to nationality* on the part of his committee. He says, the Rev. Messrs. Townley, Salter, Dewar, three Englishmen, and Rev. Mr. Mack, an Irishman, forsooth, plead the superior pretensions of Dr. Bethune, because he was born and ordained in Canada, &c. Why should Dr. Bethune be under-valued, because born and educated in this country? What savours so much of nationality, I should be glad to know, as the combination of clergymen from the Emerald Isle, which exists in this section of the Province, for the purpose of elevating to the dignified post, one of themselves? Has not the association alluded to deservedly received the cognomen of the "Irish compact?" Verily, and indeed, I would remind the Rev. gentleman of the old adage: "*People who live in glass houses should not throw stones.*"

The next accusation against this formidable committee is, that of *inconsistency*, for having, not long since, pressed as ardently upon the notice of this Diocese, the names of two clergymen, one after the other, both of whom were born, ordained and resident in the old country.

Has the author so soon forgotten, or must I refresh his oblivious memory, with a history of his own conduct some time since, towards the "other candidate?" When the question of a bishopric was first mooted, was he not warm in espousing and advocating the cause of his present favorite, not only in this, but in the mother country?

Am I right in saying, or is it merely Dame Rumor which whispers, that the unexpected apparition of a clerical importation from the "Verdant Isle," dispelled the veil from his imagination, and clearly realized as a fact, the improbability of his long cherished ambition, viz: the translation from an uncomfortable and unprofitable country cure, to the Rectory which would be rendered vacant by the elevation of the "other candidate to the episcopacy?" Did he not then openly rise against his quondam friend, and endeavor *himself*, to obtain from the old country, and elect one of her distinguished sons as our first Bishop, as it would be a graceful act towards our mother church? How is it then that he has again returned to him whom he once discarded! But has the cloven foot been at work?

He then goes on to say, "I desire not to depreciate Canadians, my sons are Canadian born, &c." I would ask him what more effectual way could he take to do so, than by ridiculing the idea of one of her sons becoming a Bishop? The Archdeacon's performance of

the d
by a
lence
an al
casio
traini
by th
"rece
fully
he his
scient
Is i
in ord
religi
metan
to bea
date?
He
deaco
have i
"the
He
Rev. g
so clo
most a
having
them
low c
Dr.
claim
electi
new I
some,
strang
men.
"oth
ink a
mock
invec
electi
letter
is a f
pated
the "

task, imposed upon

with his wrath is, part of his committee. war, three Englishmen, plead the superior worth and ordained in der-valued, because savours so much of combination of clergy- this section of the dignified post, one of deservedly received rily, and indeed, I dage : "People who

ommittee is, that of ed as ardently upon clergymen, one after and resident in the

efresh his oblivious time since, towards of a bishopric was and advocating the but in the mother

Rumor which whis- al importation from s imagination, and his long cherished fortable and unpro- be rendered vacant *piscopacy?*" Did end, and endeavor lect one of her dis- be a graceful act at he has again re- as the cloven foot

iate Canadians, my what more effectual the idea of one of n's performance of

the duties of a parish priest, he endeavors to throw cold water upon, by asking the two following questions, 1st, what induced the violence which led indignant parties to destroy the imagery erected on an altar in Dr. Bethune's new church at Cobourg? 2nd, what occasioned the severance of three theological students, from the training institution of Cobourg? Was not their separation caused by the inculcation of tenets, which they could not conscientiously "receive?" In answer to these questions, I would most respectfully ask him, 1st, the names of this theological trio, and 2nd, does he himself know the tenets which they so indignantly and conscientiously repudiated?

Is it not well known that this Tractarian outcry, has been got up in order to serve a particular purpose? Are not the Archdeacon's religious tenets exaggerated? Are not moderate high church views, metamorphised by fertile imaginations into ultra-tractarian, in order to bear an odious comparison, with those of the "*ultra low candidate?*"

He next asks what distinguished colleges conferred on the Archdeacon the degree of D.D. In answer to this, I would ask him, have money, or acknowledgements of his merits, obtained for the "*other candidate?*" his degree of D.D.?

He next alludes to the "Archdeacon's theology." Does the Rev. gentleman imagine that the theology of the "*other candidate*" so eloquently and so plausibly perverted, is palatable to every one? most assuredly not. If he blames the committee so much for not having explained Dr. Bethune's doctrines, why does he not show them a good example, and give us a striking contrast of the ultra low church views of his favorite?

Dr. Bethune's position as Archdeacon, giving him a peculiar claim is next touched upon—and he asks what occasion for an election if this should establish as a sequence, his right to be our new Bishop? He goes on to say that a fruitless effort is made by some, to obtain a precedence for Dr. Bethune, a comparative stranger, and that a cold response will be given to these five clergymen. If their attempts will be so fruitless, and the election of the "*other candidate?*" so certain, does not the wasting so much pen, ink and paper, in ridiculing their futile attempts, approach to a mockery? Why take any notice of them, and rail with such bitter invective against the claims of the Archdeacon of York? If the election of the "*other candidate?*" is so certain, why write such a letter that one almost does not know whether the Rev. Mr. Brough is a friend of Dr. Bethune or not? Surely he must have anticipated and courted a careful scrutiny of the ministerial capacity of the "*other candidate?*"! and that divine has only to thank his

quasi friend, for having his character as a clergyman canvassed, for the purpose of discussing his eligibility for the future Bishopric.

I hope that he will pardon my plainness, and excuse me for saying, that many would wish to see infused amongst us, some new element, in order that those painful and disgraceful scenes caused through the influence of party spirit and lately witnessed, may receive a wholesome check.

The other statements of my friend I shall not make any comment on, as I consider them of minor importance, and shall therefore conclude with the hope that those who have entrusted to them the election of our Bishop, will exercise a calm consideration of the respective merits of these two candidates, as they must well know how much is expected from them. Let them remember that it is not merely the interests of the church that demand it of them.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

WESTERN LAYMAN.

To the Editor of the London Prototype.

SIR,—

I had hoped that the first election for Bishop, held in the Anglican Church, in Canada, would have been conducted with that moderation and that freedom from personalities, in short, with that restraint which a good cause never fails to inculcate. That there should be differences of opinion as to the choice, and that personal friendships would influence feelings, was only to be looked for, but certainly it was no exaggeration to expect, that while ardent men would warmly espouse the cause of a candidate, they would leave unassailed the character of him whom they looked upon with no friendly feelings. It is with some regret, Sir, that I find a communication in your journal, which has led me to cease to entertain this reasonable anticipation, and I am the more disappointed from the circumstance of the writer being a clergyman—one, too, who has not the excuse of youth and inexperience as an apology. Had this proceeding been provoked, there might have been some palliation for it, but so far as I have been able to watch the proceedings of the friends of Archdeacon Bethune, there has not been one word in the least disparaging to the character of any person. The dignified and modest circular put forth by the five clergymen of the western portion of the diocese, so far as tone and language are considered, is perfectly unassailable. The only course open to those who dif-

gymans canvassed, for
the future Bishopric.
And excuse me for say-
ing amongst us, some new
graceful scenes caused
only witnessed, may re-

not make any comment
and shall therefore
be intrusted to them the
consideration of the
they must well know
in remember that it is
mand it of them.

nt,
ERN LAYMAN.

ototype.

p, held in the Angli-
conducted with that
s, in short, with that
eulate. That there
ce, and that personal
to be looked for, but
at while ardent men
they would leave un-
upon with no friend,
find a communication
entertain this reason-
ed from the circum-
too, who has not the
ogy. Had this pro-
n some palliation for
proceedings of the
t been one word in
erson. The dignified
men of the western
unge are considered,
en to those who dif-

fered from its recommendations, was to state the claims which they deemed so pre-eminent as to lead them to desire a different result, to that which it sought to attain. But in place of so acting, the Rev. Mr. Brough has attacked the character of Dr. Bethune in a way which it is really painful to contemplate. And I feel justified in alluding to a report current, so that it may be denied, if untrue. It is to the effect that Dr. Cronyn was a party to the attack. I say, sir, that such a report is bandied from mouth to mouth. Of its truth I know nothing, and I leave it to the two clergymen implicated to deal with as they see fit.

Under the eight heads which Mr. Brough adopts, it is evident that the meaning is insinuated rather than plainly put forth. The reason is sufficiently obvious, for really it is somewhat difficult to attack the character of Dr. Bethune. He is a man against whom not even the semblance of a calumny will stick. He is free from the taint of all questionable money operations. In the discharge of his clerical duties, and in the arduous labours of directing the Theological Seminary, has his whole life been passed. We may except, however, the period devoted to literary pursuits; for the Archdeacon conducted for years the *Church* newspaper with great vigor and ability, and has published some volumes of sermons, which have deservedly attracted great attention. There was, therefore, but one point on which even the most illiberal criticism could be made, and that was on the score of his opinions. To represent these as extreme was all that opportunity permitted. Among the personal friends of Dr. Bethune the accusation created merriment, for of all men, he is most moderate, avoiding the extremes which many sincere, but ill-judging, parties affect; and if there is one point on which his claim is pre-eminent, it is on the score of his matured opinions, which, without luke-warmness, follow the plain, straight path which sincerity and charity point out. It is hardly necessary to meet *seriatim* the objections of Mr. Brough, for some are easily answered. But with regard to the degree of Doctor, conferred on the Archdeacon, does Mr. Brough mean that it is unworthily bestowed? The following extract of an address to Dr. Bethune, signed by all the ex-students of the Theological Seminary, except one, in holy orders, must certainly satisfy Mr. Brough's doubts:

"We desire, Sir, to express publicly and unequivocally our persuasion that the prelections delivered by you, whilst we were residents of the Institution, never evinced any temper or disposition which, in the slightest degree, merited the imputation of party spirit. It is not to be expected that any considerable number of individuals, enjoying perfect freedom of thought and inquiry, should

concur without the smallest variation in every minute particular of theological teaching. Making allowance, therefore, for this unavoidable diversity of the human mind, we are well assured that *the standard of Divinity which you have adopted is built upon the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, and the authentic expositions set forth by the Church of England in her articles and formularies.* We feel satisfied that in all things you have been influenced by an enlightened and affectionate attachment to the Church, and in the course of your instructions have fairly represented her opinions, and fully and faithfully carried out her distinctive principles. * * * In regard to your manner of communicating that teaching let it be sufficient to say that no one, acquainted with your personal qualities, will be reluctant to believe that this was always distinguished by the utmost patience, courtesy and kindness."

We have, on this point, likewise, the high testimony of Bishop Strachan. In his charge, delivered on the 8th June, 1844, his Lordship says :

"I can scarcely express my satisfaction in terms sufficiently strong in regard to the Theological Seminary, which was established at Cobourg, a few years ago. It was, from the first, placed under the sole management of the Rev. Dr. Bethune, and *has prospered far beyond my most sanguine expectations—a success which I chiefly attribute to the superior ability and sound discretion with which it has been conducted by its learned and amiable professor, to whom my thanks, as well as those of the Diocese, are justly due, and are hereby cordially tendered.*"

With such records of Dr. Bethune's labors, surely Mr. Brough must feel ashamed to ask if the degree was conferred "in acknowledgement of his acquirements," but if the latter has doubts on the matter, it would have been far better for him to have stated fairly the grounds on which he assumes that the Archdeacon is not a learned man, than insinuate a want of capacity. There is one fact which is incontrovertible, that never was Dr. Bethune placed in any emergency to which he was unequal. His published writings testify his thoughtful mind, and to them do I turn to confute the idle nonsense which has been urged against him. Of honesty of purpose, himself to the last, he extended to those professing the opinions which led them from the fold of the Anglican Church, a belief in their sincerity, and took the hopeful view that their aberrations would be but for a time. For his own opinions, however, we may turn to a volume of Sermons on the Lord's Supper, published in 1852. In this book we read :

"A right understanding of this sacrament would cause us to avoid those mystic views which would spiritualise the ordinance

away, and outward hearts' love of this s the novel and winsome body protests ture, over to many too, from stituted whom he view, it nature standing shed up

And Brough Instituted dered a the three and of remaining ordained the Archdeacon the most second, that he said so by the which a trouble that w those blame those w

As t ance of can be none of his to disti tivated

nute particular of
re, for this un-
assured that *the*
is built upon the
istic expositions set
and formularies.
influenced by an
hurch, and in the
ted her opinions,
principles. *
ting that teaching
with your personal
was always distin-
dness."

timony of Bishop
in June, 1844, his

sufficiently strong
as established at
placed under the
has prospered far
which I chiefly
tion with which it
professor, to whom
justly due, and are

uinely Mr. Brough
urred "in acknow-
has doubts on the
have stated fairly
hdeacon is not a
There is one fact
ethune placed in
published writings
rn to confute the
n. Of honesty of
se professing the
nglican Church, a
v that their aber-
pinions, however,
Supper, published

ould cause us to
se the ordinance

away, and leave no outward sign to contemplate, nor through the outward senses allow us to appropriate the inward grace to the hearts' holiest affections. And on the other hand, a correct view of this sacrament will be found directly and positively to contradict the novel tenet of *transubstantiation*, which asserts that the bread and wine in the sacrament is literally and substantially changed into the body and blood of Christ. Our branch of the Church Catholic protests against this error, as repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthrowing the nature of a sacrament, and giving occasion to many superstitions. * * * * It is absurd and irrational, too, from the fact that our Lord, when he used the words that instituted this sacrament, was still in his own person before those to whom he addressed them; so that to be consistent in this Romish view, it would be necessary to believe that his whole and complete nature was transferred to those elements at the very time he was standing before them, and before his body was broken, or his blood shed upon the cross."

And against this sober, unmistakeable, evangelical view, Mr. Brough sets the fact that three students receded from the Cobourg Institute, and dwells upon some wretched story about an embroidered altar cloth. Had he inquired, he would have known that of the three young men, one left for the reverse of theological reasons, and of him, perhaps, the less said will be the best course. Of the remaining two: one, the Rev. J. W. Marsh, was subsequently ordained by the Bishop of Toronto, and one of the examiners was the Archdeacon, and it was never said but that Mr. Marsh obtained the most fair and courteous treatment from the Archdeacon. The second, Dr. Helmuth, has never asserted, so far as I can learn, that he withdrew owing to erroneous teaching, at least he never said so to the Bishops of Quebec and Toronto. So what is meant by the question, except to create one of these suggestive doubts which are insinuated covertly, it is difficult to say. The altar cloth trouble really is too contemptible to allude to. Suffice it to say, that without any desire to revert to a disagreeable event, that even those who, in a fit of passion, did remove the cloth, imputed no blame to Dr. Bethune. If blame were at all given, it was by those who thought he ceded too much for the sake of peace.

As to the spotless character of Dr. Bethune, and his performance of the duties of a parish priest, I can myself speak. No one can be more beloved, and, I may add, that, of his congregation, none stronger than the Irish have a faith in the truth and firmness of his principles. Quiet, unobtrusive, with an ear constantly open to distress, natural, genial and hospitable, bringing to society a cultivated mind, he has endeavoured in his sphere to propagate these

high principles, without which society is a mere *pal aestia* for gain.

And if I, for one, humbly, but earnestly labor for the elevation of Dr. Bethune to the Bishopric, it is because I deem him a good, pure, and able man, and because I believe him to be an embodiment of the principles of that faith to which I belong, and because I am,

A CHURCHMAN.

THE NEW BISHOPRIC: WHO SHALL BE BISHOP?

From the Norfolk Messenger.

The postponement of the meeting of the new Synod for the election of Bishop, for the Western Diocese has had the effect of encouraging the friends of the two candidates to canvass their merits, and throughout the district it is evident that the result is looked for with no ordinary interest. Our readers are aware that the two gentlemen named, are Archdeacon Bethune of Cobourg, and Doctor Cronyn of London; and to judge by what is published in the journals, we should say that the question is, to some extent, one of personal considerations; rather than depending on what are called parties in the Church. Some attempt, however, has been made by a London clergyman, a Mr. Brough, in a circular sent throughout the country, to throw doubts upon Doctor Bethune's character: insinuating that he is a man of unquestionable learning, and that he possesses Tractarian opinions. In every way such a course is to be condemned, we can hardly think that Doctor Cronyn, will profit much by the ill-judged zeal of his friend, which, it is proper to remark a correspondent of the London *Prototype* traces directly to Doctor Cronyn's inspiration. The career of Doctor Bethune is ample proof that he is no common man, and we think that he is fairly entitled to the pre-eminence claimed for him by his friends. For some years he conducted with great success the Episcopal College at Cobourg, and he has periodically given to the world volumes of Sermons, marked by good sense and moderation. It is in these works—the result of his matured convictions—that his opinions are to be found, and those who question his theology should bring passages from his books, to prove their assertion, and not revive meaningless tales, which although they amount to nothing, gain their point by insinuation. We interfere in this matter because we consider that the treatment to which Doctor Bethune has been subjected is singularly unfair, and it is not creditable to the Church of England that clergymen should be his assailants in the manner they have acted. We must, however, do the Rev. Mr. Brough the

Y.
e *palaeitia* for gain.
oor for the elevation
I deem him a good,
am to be an embodi-
belong, and because

CHURCHMAN.

BE BISHOP ?

new Synod for the
as had the effect of
anvass their merits,
the result is looked
aware that the two
 Cobourg, and Doctor
blished in the jour-
extent, one of per-
what are called par-
has been made by a
sent throughout the
s character: insin-
, and that he poss-
course is to be con-
n, will profit much
proper to remark a
directly to Doctor
hune is ample proof
e is fairly entitled
friends. For some
iscopal College at
world volumes of
n. It is in these
at his opinions are
should bring passa-
not revive mean-
thing, gain their
r because we con-
has been subjec-
to the Church of
the manner they
Mr. Brough the

justice to say that he seems to be ashamed of his hasty zeal, for in a second communication, he, with some warmth, repudiates the idea of saying the least thing derogatory to Archdeacon Bethune, admitting his purity of life, the irreproachable manner in which he has fulfilled his parochial duties, and unhesitatingly recognizing his scholarship, but still retaining the feeling that he is not best fitted for the office of Bishop. On viewing the whole features of the case we entertain the directly opposite opinion—and we shall briefly state our reasons, deeming the importance of the issue a sufficient warrant for our interference.

The object of the elevation of a clergyman to the Bishopric, we conceive, would by no reasonable man be narrowed to the hope of seeing any set of opinions dominant. Admitting even that wide distinctions existed in the Anglican communion, paramount to every other thought it would be the desire to establish a system of religious teaching which would have a practical effect in controlling and restraining humanity. Dr. Bethune's high qualifications are admitted by his opponents, and the only objection against him is that he is a "Puseyite." It is true that this accusation is not made in their *ipsissima verba*—for the very good reason that it is not tenable. Copies of the Archdeacon's works have been placed in our hands, and so far as we can judge, as laymen, and really it is a matter within the comprehension of any person who can read and think—there does not appear to us the least ground for imputing to him extreme views on any one point. Here certainly must be found the true criterion of Dr. Bethune's opinions. But it seems that while editing *The Church* newspaper, he alluded to the "Tracts for the Times," and called them remarkable productions. We never heard the fact doubted by any one who had read them. Nor can any one at all conversant with the religious history of the Mother Country, of the last twenty years, fail to recognize the extraordinary influence which these papers possessed. Thus against forty years active life as a clergyman, fifteen or so of which, if we are not mistaken, were passed as the head of a College, having published some volumes of Sermons—against all this is to be placed the fact that Dr. Bethune said something not unfriendly to a publication on its appearance; that three students out of a hundred left the institution over which he presided; and that somebody removed an oak altar table from his church which somebody else put there; and with which it is not pretended the Archdeacon had any thing to do. Really we cannot conceal our contempt for the paltry pettishness which would assail a good man on such slight cause. We do sincerely hope that those who have to determine this issue will think very seriously of their obligations. Much is expected from them, and

they should satisfy their own minds of the principle on which they have to act. Our view of the case is, that this cry unfairly raised against Doctor Bethune, has its origin in the fact, that he can be assailed on no other ground. Until it was known that his degree of Doctor of Divinity was obtained at the same College where the Bishop of Toronto gained his, some sneers were cast upon his attainments, the publication of this fact has however, silenced the incipient impertinence. And we presume, that the paltry fact of three young men, neither of them marked by more than ordinary intelligence or possessing any but common place attainments leaving an institution, will be considered a censure when it is a matter of record that Bishop Strachan, publicly thanked Doctor Bethune, for his conduct of it, attributing entirely to his management its success: and when all the clergy of the Province who were educated there with one exception, presented an address to the Principal, recognizing his piety, his earnestness, and his evangelical teaching. The thing is too absurd. The third item of unfitness—the altar table—was a matter with which we are told Doctor Bethune, had nothing to do. But it was simply this—some young gentlemen in Cobourg subscribed and presented a communion table to the church, the front of it was divided into compartments. In the centre was the monogram *I. H. S.* In each side was a bas relief of the implements used at the crucifixion. Parties in the place disliking the design, went in one night and defaced the panels. Next day, or so, the table was removed by Doctor Bethune, and who interfered, not to foment quarrels, but to establish peace, so that his church should not be disgraced by quarrels. And if any blame at all was cast upon him, it was that he had ordered the removal of the table. We have made some efforts to obtain information on these points, as we have considered the attack on Doctor Bethune, discreditable to all concerned in it. Indeed, the Archdeacon has our very cordial wishes for his election, for we believe him to be a good, sincere, and able man.

To the Editor of the Stratford Examiner.

SIR,—The *Stratford Examiner* of the 7th instant, was yesterday put into my hands, it contains a letter from the Revd. W. Patterson, with his critique on a communication of mine, addressed to the *Middlesex Prototype*. I quite agree with Mr. Patterson, that in making the Press the medium of setting forth my sentiments, it is perfectly legitimate to regard what I advance as public property, and that as matter of course, I subject myself to whatever strictures

7.
eiple on which they
cry unfairly raised
ct, that he can be
wn that his degree of
ge where the Bish-
st upon his attain-
, silenced the inci-
paltry fact of three
an ordinary intelli-
ments leaving an in-
s a matter of record
or Bethune, for his
gement its success :
were educated there
the Principal, recog-
angelical teaching.
unfitness—the altar
ector Bethune, had
young gentlemen in
table to the church,

In the centre was
relief of the imple-
place disliking the
hells. Next day, or
and who interfered,
so that his church
y blame at all was
removal of the table.
on on these points,
thune, discreditable
n has our very cor-
be a good, sincere,

aminer.

stant, was yesterday
e Revd. W. Patter-
mine, addressed to
Mr. Patterson, that
n my sentiments, it
as public property,
whatever strictures

the public may think proper to pronounce concerning me. In addressing you I take the opportunity to acknowledge the courtesy of my Revd. Brother, and to assure him that I take altogether in good part what has fallen from his pen. The correspondence between us pertains to a most important subject. Mr. Patterson gives happy expression to his views of its seriousness. I respond to his sentiments, and to the fervency of his desire that we may have a due sense of the magnitude of our responsibilities in relation to it. I am happy that in this respect we coincide, while in the details of the question we widely differ. Mr. Patterson regards the Venerable the Archdeacon of York, as a fit and proper person to be the Bishop of our new Western Diocese. I think otherwise. It will be sufficient for me to state some of my reasons for entertaining this opinion, and in compliance with the call made upon me by my reverend friend, I think I am prepared to show, both from what may be implied, and also affirmed, that Dr. Bethune is chargeable with opinions calculated to raise, what my friend calls "the cry of Puseyism," and also with sentiments inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of England. But before I proceed to do so, I must notice some of your correspondent's strictures on my letter. He would represent me as expressing surprise, that the gentlemen who have formed themselves into a committee should advocate the claims of a Canadian and a resident of the Province, to be our Bishop. I entertain no such feelings, nor would I for a moment presume to say, that a Canadian, as such, ought not to be our Bishop, but I do feel surprised that the gentlemen of the committee whom I named in my letter, taking antecedents in their proceedings into account, should advance the circumstance of Dr. Bethune's birthplace as a plea for his elevation. I may be incredulous, and perhaps do them injustice, but I cannot persuade myself unless they assure me to the contrary, that it is any other than an *ad captandum* argument. And if as an argument it is to be carried out, then I say as in my former letter, an Eastern for the East, and a Western for the West. I moreover ask what has Dr. Bethune contributed to our western endowment, now secured, not a farthing, while the Rector of London has subscribed five hundred pounds. But it is already rumoured that the committee in despair of success for the venerable the Archdeacon, contemplate putting forward another candidate. I agree with Mr. Patterson, that in reality the plea of "Canadian birth" is "far from occupying in the estimation of these gentlemen" three English and one Irish, "that importance" which the prominence they have given to it in their address would seem to indicate, neither was it "the importance" of the consideration whether the aspirant to the episcopate pertained to the old or

the new country, that led me to notice it at the length to which my friend takes exception, but it seemed to me as a stroke at *effect*, and a ruse to obtain *elact* for a candidate. Your correspondent complains (I may adopt the following order.)

1. That "I have disposed summarily of Dr. Bethune's pretensions to the episcopate, founded on his energy in the performance of his parochial duties," that I have done so by "enquiring the cause of the violence committed upon an altar in the new church at Cobourg." I expressed no doubt to his parochial energy, but the question I put implied what I felt, namely, astonishment that any parochial clergyman of our reformed church should allow an altar with carved images to be placed within his chancel, and his doing so would, with me, be a sufficient reason why he should not be our Bishop. Would it be very acceptable to the members of the church at Stratford were Mr. Patterson to do the same? Would it not very soon put to the test "the forbearance or the violence of parties." So much for my question, but the transaction no doubt, to use my friend's words, "deserves a better criticism," and I am prepared to render it whenever it becomes expedient; in the meantime I venture to recommend to the perusal of all concerned, the homily of our church, "against the peril of idolatry."

2. The severance of three theological students from the Cobourg Institution. Mr. Patterson also says, I disposed of Dr. Bethune's merits as theological professor, by affirming that "the separation of these young men from the institution was occasioned by the inculcation of tenets which they could not conscientiously receive." "Who," he asks, "does not see that the reasoning on this point erects the conscientious convictions of the reverend gentlemen into a tribunal before which the orthodoxy or the heterodoxy of the doctrines taught is to be decided?" He adds, "is this argument?" Mr. Patterson has studied logic more recently than I have, still I venture in this instance to question his soundness in the science. The facts are simply as follows:—Dr. Bethune objected to the doctrines of these three gentlemen—their doctrines are examined and approved by the highest authorities of the church, the proof of which is established by their admission to holy orders, one in the diocese of Toronto, one in the diocese of Quebec, and the third in the old country. Then I say, these authorities are the tribunal before which the orthodoxy of the young men is tried, and by which are tested (I shall not say) "the orthodoxy or the heterodoxy" of Dr. Bethune but the tenets he inculcated, and his views of the teaching of our reformed church. So much for Mr. Patterson's reasoning! Perhaps he may not now be so disposed to think that "the argument in the letter has but little bearing upon the real point at issue."

3. Mr. as entitled undertak has said, he perta have im reed ac not brea originate the Arch supporte 4. As indulgin paragrap facts?" opportun may con quote fr friend to acknowl the Tim individu peculiar "We kn condemn from in Surely t confiden sands of Surely t moderat enuncia "We ha tions ag but we fully ex ever." "Carefu determin but I sh Again, sault— these e Protesta

length to which my
as a stroke at *effect*,
Your correspondent

Mr. Bethune's pretensions in the performance of his duty by "enquiring the archdeaconial energy, but my astonishment that the church should allow an *arch* to stand in his chancel, and his *curate* to stand in the same? Would it be for the violence of transaction no doubt, "criticism," and I am afraid; in the mean-
of all concerned, the *folly*."

Extracts from the Cobourg *Review* of Dr. Bethune's *Tracts* state that "the separation of the *Archdeacon* was occasioned by the inculcation of heterodoxy, which he *unconsciously* received." "Reasoning on this point has brought a number of learned gentlemen into the heterodoxy of the *Archdeacon*. Is this argument?" "More than I have, still I have no knowledge in the science. I have objected to the doctrinal *Tracts* as are examined and *criticized* by the *Archdeacon*, the proof of which is in the *Archdeacon's* *Tracts*, one in the *Archdeacon's* *Tracts*, and the third in the *Archdeacon's* *Tracts*. These are the tribunal on which the *Archdeacon* is tried, and by whom he is condemned for heterodoxy." "I have examined and his views of the *Archdeacon's* *Tracts* as proposed to think that the *Archdeacon* was acting upon the real

3. Mr. Patterson asks me, are Dr. Bethune's acquirements such as entitle him to the degree of D. D.? I answer, I by no means undertake to be the judge in the matter. The Rev. Mr. Townley has said, aye, and I leave it to his higher pretensions, especially as he pertains to the committee of five, who announce that "they have impartially considered the qualifications of all," and have decreed accordingly. This I will say, that if plumage is disturbed, not breathings from my lips, but inflations from another quarter originated the commotion. I have had no desire to do dishonor to the Archdeacon's literary status, but I think it as little became his supporters to advance it in comparative and ostentatious display.

4. As to Tractarianism, Mr. Patterson writes, "Why, instead of indulging in loose interrogatories, does not the latter take up the paragraph and combat its assertions by a particular induction of facts?" My questions surely afford Dr. Bethune's friends a good opportunity to enlarge upon and refute any imputations they may contain, but as your correspondent demands it of me, I shall quote from Dr. Bethune's writings, and leave it to my reverend friend to draw his "particular induction of facts." The doctor, in acknowledging the receipt of the two first parts of the "Tracts for the Times," writes, "we hold ourselves indebted to the enterprising individual, be he who he may, who has placed these *valuable* and peculiar theological productions so closely within our reach." "We know that in many—perhaps a majority of instances—the condemnation of the imputed errors of the Oxford Tracts emanates from individuals who were mere tyros in theological learning." Surely the Archdeacon did not take time to consider when, in the confidence of his own judgment, he designates as tyros the thousands of laymen and clergymen who differ from him in opinion. Surely this high-handed decree affords cause of suspicion as to the moderation of his views, yet the committee say "these he has ever enunciated in a conciliatory and moderate tone!" Again, he writes, "We have not merely received with distrust the floating accusations against the heretical tendency of the 'Tracts for the Times,' but we have been led to believe that, if *fairly weighed* and *carefully examined*, they would be found to contain more truth than ever." Doubtless they would were Dr. Bethune to hold the balance. "Carefully examined:" a careful examination might, perchance, determine a preponderance of something useful in the rattlesnake, but I should exceedingly dislike proximity to the noxious creature. Again, the Archdeacon writes, "This vehemence of polemical assault—this apparent desire to sweep away with the besom of wrath these emanations from some of the *most distinguished divines* of a Protestant and learned University,—was calculated to awaken the

impression that there was more zeal than judgment, more warmth than justice, in the denunciations that we promulgated against them." Now, what could "tyros" do in "polemical assault," what would the "besom" be in such hands, and what suggested these belligerent metaphors to the mind of one whom the committee would represent as an impersonation of "impartiality and toleration?" Was it emanations from the distinguished divines that induced this warmth of response? To quote again, "To those who are desirous of learning in sincerity the truth of this controversy, we cannot offer a better recommendation than to procure and peruse them for themselves. They may possibly be startled by some strange opinions, but the alarm *in most instances*, we believe, will prove to be one which a candid construction of their meaning, and the general bearing of their writings, will dispel." The Archdeacon seems to contemplate not only alarm, but positive danger in some instances. He adds: "Certain we are, at least, that they cannot fail to derive instruction and benefit from them as a whole." Now, let us suppose Dr. Bethune presiding over a theological school, or presiding over this diocese, or addressing a visitation charge to an assemblage, clerical and lay, in St. Paul's Church, London, and expressing himself in the foregoing terms, reciting his own recorded language, telling his hearers that he "could not offer a better recommendation, relative to Tractarianism, than to procure and peruse the Tracts for the Times," saying "possibly you may be startled by some strange opinions, but certain we are that you cannot fail to derive benefit from them as a whole." Would not this warrant the "cry of Tractarianism?" would not one universal cry pronounce, "Aha, aha, our eye hath seen it!" Would it not affix to any man who would express himself as above quoted, the charge of "Puseyism." "No grounds then for the cry;" "Puseyism, Tractarianism;" no necessity for vigilance on the part of the church in this Diocese, against tenets which have led almost every man of those whose writings Dr. Bethune has applauded, downward to Rome; they, with their families, hearers, and kindred, are in numerous instances now embosened in that communion. Were it not, as I trust I may say, that God is with us, and with our church of a truth, we should be like unto Newman, like unto Wilberforce, and others in apostacy, and the "two first parts of the Tracts for the Times," for which Dr. Bethune "held himself so much indebted," are the two first steps in the downward tendency. I do not say that the Archdeacon of York so believes, neither I suppose did Archdeacon Wilberforce, neither probably did Archdeacon Dennison at first, but the issue has proved the danger, and demands it of all to watch. My friend, Mr. Patterson, so many years my junior, in his integrity

gment, more warmth promulgated against "emical assault," what that suggested these whom the committee partiality and tolerated divines that again, "To those truth of this contro- than to procure and sibly be startled by nstances, we believe, on of their meaning, dispeL" The Arch- at positive danger in at least, that they m them as a whole." a theological school, visitation charge to church, London, and in his own recorded not offer a better re- to procure and peruse you may be startled that you cannot fail d not this warrant iversal cry pronoune, not affix to any man charge of "Pusey- seyism, Tractarian- the church in this very man of those ownward to Rome; are in numerous Were it not, as I r church of a truth, erforce, and others sets for the Times," indebted," are the o not say that the se did Archdeacon ennison at first, but it of all to watch. or, in his integrity

contemplates not the depths of the Tractarian delusion, he knows not yet its insidious character, I pray God, that he and his, and the church throughout this land, may ever be preserved from its fallacies and wiles. I do not apprehend that Dr. Bethune will prove recreant to the fatal extent; my hope and my persuasion is, that he is sounder than his words; but still words go forth, impressions are made, effects produced, and recall becomes impossible. I connect these circumstances with the case I have supposed, namely, Dr. Bethune presiding over a theological institution, or delivering an Episcopal charge in the language upon which I have just remarked. One more objection as called for by Mr. Patterson. Dr. Bethune has set forth that "the canons of councils, the writings of large numbers of primitive divines, and the interpretations of the church, proceed from the same inspiration as the Word of God." The Church of England teaches (Articles 19, 20,) that churches have erred not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith, and that general councils may err, and sometimes have erred in things pertaining unto God, wherefore things ordained by them have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture." Are not then the Archdeacon's views (unwittingly, no doubt) at variance, as I proposed to show, with the teachings of our reformed church? Are they entitled to the encomiums pronounced in the address of the five clergymen, and which Mr. Patterson seems disposed to endorse? Did these gentlemen examine them for themselves before they invited the clergy and lay delegates "to weigh them well and seriously." I will repeat what I advanced in former letters, that the agitation of these questions, and this unpleasant controversy may be ascribed to the aggressive publications of Dr. Bethune's friends. Painful though it be, I hope it is ordered for good; I regard it not as a dispute about words or men, but a contest for the integrity of our Protestant Church. Mr. Editor, I have already occupied too much of your space, but suffer me to add another word. Mr. Patterson calls on me to quote from Dr. Bethune's recently published Sermon on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. I decline for the present to quote from his recently published works, unless Mr. P. can show me that he has therein distinctly, and intelligibly and manfully repudiated his opinions as set forth in his review of Dr. Pusey's Sermon on the Eucharist, for which said divine was silenced in Oxford.

I am, &c.,

CHAS. C. BROUFGH.

May 11, 1857.

THE REV. MR. PATTERSON'S REPLY.

To the Editor of the Stratford Examiner.

SIR,—The *Middlesex Prototype*, in its issue of the 15th ult., contains a letter from the Rev. Mr. Brough in reply to my communication which recently appeared in your columns in favor of the claims of the Archdeacon of York to the occupation of the future See of London. Really, Sir, I feel myself highly flattered by the fact that Mr. Brough has condescended to reply to my observations, particularly as his letter, addressed to the Rev. Mr. Nelles, has as I think, already received, through the Press, a far abler notice than it has received from me. Since, however, he has done me the honor of replying to my letter, I beg to acknowledge the attention, and to occupy a portion of your space with some remarks upon his last circular.

The main point of his first letter addressed to Mr. Nelles, has in his reply to me,—as your readers will observe by examining the third paragraph—been fairly abandoned, viz: the point which refers to Dr. Bethune's literary acquirements. And here I must embrace the opportunity of acknowledging the candour of the Rev. gentleman. Mr. Brough evidently possesses a sufficient amount of penetration to enable him to judge how much stress to lay upon an argument. He is too sound a scholar not to know that Dr. Bethune's literary acquirements, if compared with those of any clergymen within the bounds of the proposed Diocese, be he English, Irish, Scotch or Canadian, would not suffer by the comparison.

In thus suggesting the idea of comparison, I have departed, somewhat from the course which I had resolved to pursue, and must in justification, plead the precedent furnished by Mr. Brough, to which I now invite his attention.

In my previous letter I studiously avoided invidious comparisons and endeavoured to confine our discussion within as narrow bounds as possible. But by introducing a direct allusion to the respected Rector of London in the prominent manner in which he has introduced it in his letter, Mr. Brough has enlarged the area of controversy, and with him must rest the responsibility of the result.

1. Against Dr. Bethune's claim to the episcopate drawn from the fact that he is a Canadian, the only semblance of reasoning which remains is, "an Eastern for the East and a Western for the West;" and this shadow of an argument he labors to invest with an enduring substance by making use of the connecting particle, "moreover," and then affirming that Dr. Bethune has not subscribed a farthing to the endowment fund, while the Rector of

REPLY.

caminer.

the 15th ult.,
a reply to my com-
lumns in favor of the
pation of the future
hly flattered by the
y to my observations,
. Mr. Nelles, has as
far abler notice than
e has done me the
yledge the attention,
e remarks upon his

o Mr. Nelles, has in
by examining the
: the point which
And here I must
candour of the Rev.
sufficient amount of
tress to lay upon an
that Dr. Bethune's
e of any clergymen
he English, Irish,
parison.
, I have departed,
ved to persue, and
hed by Mr. Brough,

vidious comparisons
n as narrow bounds
on to the respected
which he has intro-
the area of contro-
of the result.

eciate drawn from
lance of reasoning
a Western for the
ors to invest with
nnecting particle,
hune has not sub-
hile the Rector of

London has subscribed 2000 dollars. Dignified contrast! Profound reasoning! It is not affirmed that a subscription was solicited from the Venerable Archdeacon, and yet his rejection or acceptance by the Western Clergy and Laity as their Bishop is, in some mysterious and inexplicable manner to be associated with the fact of his not having subscribed towards the Episcopal Fund, and then the invurious contrast is drawn. Sir, I disparage no man, I speak harshly of no man. I admire the energy which the able and respected Rector of London and other Rev. gentlemen have displayed in completing the endowment. But would it not have been better for Mr. Brough's cause had the contrast not been instituted. As an argument it is peurile, as a published statement it is offensive to good taste.

Sir, my only concern is with Mr. Brough's argument, and therefore I intend no insinuation against any party. But Mr. Brough's knowledge of the rapidity and ease with which affluence may be acquired in this rising country ought surely to induce him to hesitate ere he infers that a large subscription is of itself, an infalliable test of munificence, unless it can be clearly shown that the gift has occasioned inconvenience to the donor, and has drawn largely upon his means. This statement of my Rev. friend is, to adopt his own phraseology, an unmistakeable *ruse* to obtain *eclat* for a candidate. And were the case the reverse, had Dr. Bethune proposed to give £500 to the fund, and had the Rector of London not given a farthing, what would have been the inference of my learned friend? I pretend not to say at what conclusion he he would have arrived. But in this controversy which is every day acquiring increased warmth, and assuming ampler dimensions, who shall undertake to say that Dr. Bethune's proffered aid would not be represented as a kind of bait to secure the suffrages of the Clergy and Laity of the West?

But, Sir, the impression which Mr. Brough wishes to produce by the statement "an Eastern for the East, and a Western for the West"—for he still clings to it—and from the contrast which he puts forth between the liberality of the rich man, and the supposed niggardliness of the poor man, will not be received by those charged with the high responsibility of electing a chief pastor for the Western See. With practical men—with men who duly estimate the importance of the issue of this contest—with men of correct taste and elevated feelings—with men whose best regards concentre in the good of our reformed church, and whose sincerest prayers and warmest wishes are directed to her substantial progress, and to the dissemination of her glorious principles throughout the length and breadth of the land,—with such men the contrast of my respected

friend, and his plea based upon locality, will be of no avail when placed side by side with the solid argument drawn from great attainments, laborious activity, distinguished services, and—I quote from the *Leader*—“unblemished purity of life.”

2. For an explanation in regard to the violence done to the altar in the Archdeacon's Church, I beg to refer the Rev. Mr. Brough to the accompanying statement of facts which you, Sir, had the kindness to say you would insert in your next issue. A perusal of it will show how far Dr. Bethune deserves the charitable censure covertly contained in Mr. Brough's recommendation “to all concerned to peruse the homily of the church on the peril of idolatry.” The slight irritation of feeling disclosed in the question he puts with reference to the conduct of the members of the Church at Stratford under supposed circumstances, shall not induce me to impugn the motive which he has, either in proposing the question, or in drawing attention to the homily which treats of the subject of idolatry. But, Sir, I am certain Mr. Brough will agree with me when I say, that there is an idol against the worship of which it is the duty of all constantly to be on our guard; that there is a shrine before which if we studiously refrain from paying our homage, the integrity of our principles will not be impaired: viz., the idol of popular applause, the shrine at which those who pander to popular prejudices are accustomed to offer their adoration.

3. I shall endeavour to show that Mr. Brough has not fairly met my reasoning in the case of the three reverend gentlemen who withdrew from the Cobourg Institution. But first I must beg his attention to some further light which has been recently thrown upon the subject. It turns out—I quote from a letter by a “Churchman,” in the last *Prototype*—that one gentleman withdrew for the reverse of theological reasons, and that of him the less that is said the better; another was subsequently examined by the Archdeacon and approved; the third—the Rev. Dr. Helmuth—it appears extremely probable, never asserted that he withdrew owing to erroneous teaching. So much then for the facts as published, with which I shall leave Mr. Brough to deal.

And now for the logic of my respected friend. I receive in all the breadth of its meaning the proposition, that the venerable prelates who admitted these gentlemen to holy orders constitute the tribunal before which to test the soundness or unsoundness of their doctrines. And I beg to keep this proposition distinctly before Mr. Brough for a few moments, and to bring to bear upon it a fact which we shall both, I am sure, admit as evidence in the matter in question.

The fact is this: the doctrines to which the three gentlemen

objected
who, af
Bishop
Diocese
gentle
the fac
ordaine
conclus
Is it th
or that
see the
test of
of thre
Observ
30 as a
ance,
overtu
teachin
former
merita
on the
convic
of doc
what
versal
shall
funda
in the
opini

In
to fas
may b
has b
the o
him
whic
detac
such
is it,
his p
as w
them
real

A

of no avail when from great attain-
ment—I quote from

done to the altar Rev. Mr. Brough you, Sir, had the
ue. A perusal of charitable censure
ation "to all con-
peril of idolatry." question he puts
of the Church at
not induce me to
sing the question,
s of the subject of
will agree with me
hip of which it is
t there is a shrine
g our homage, the
: viz., the idol of
pander to popular

has not fairly met
gentlemen who
rst I must beg his
ently thrown upon
r by a "Church-
withdrew for the
e less that is said
y the Archdeacon
muth—it appears
thdrew owing to
ets as published,

I receive in all
the venerable pre-
ers constitute the
oundness of their
distinctly before
ear upon it a fact
in the matter in

three gentlemen

objected were conscientiously received by some 30 or 40 gentlemen, who, after examination and approval were ordained by the Venerable Bishop of Toronto, and are now exercising their ministry in his Diocese. Taking then, the rejection of the doctrines by the three gentlemen, and their acceptance by 30 or 40, in connection with the fact, that all parties concerned were examined, approved, and ordained by the highest authority in the church, what is the logical conclusion as regards the soundness of the doctrines in question? Is it that the tenets were unsound because rejected by the three, or that they were unsound because accepted by the 30? Here you see the matter is brought to a simple issue. It amounts to a contest of opposite probabilities between the conscientious convictions of three and of 30 as to the soundness or unsoundness of dogma. Observe I do not advance the acceptance of the doctrines by the 30 as a proof of their soundness. But I do hold that the acceptance, approved as it was by the highest authority of the church, overthrows Mr. Brough's argument against the soundness of the teaching; and I humbly submit that the position assumed in my former letter remains untouched, viz., that to estimate Dr. Bethune's merits as a Theological Professor by the rejection of his teaching on the part of the three gentlemen is to erect their conscientious convictions into a tribunal, before which the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of doctrine is to be decided. As I previously stated I do not know what particular doctrines are alluded to. But I believe it is universally admitted,—I am certain at least that Mr. Brough and I shall concur in the admission—that, provided no point strictly fundamental is infringed,—there is a sufficiently wide margin left in the dogmatic teachings of the church for slight differences of opinion.

In entering upon Mr. Brough's fourth point, in which he strives to fasten upon Archdeacon Bethune the charge of Tractarianism, I may be permitted to take exception to the course of argument which has been adopted. If we would ascertain, fully and accurately, the opinions of a writer upon a given subject, we are not doing him justice unless we take in review the whole of those passages which refer to that subject. It is, as a general rule unfair to select detached passages from an author and to draw conclusions from such passages as to what are his real sentiments. Still more unfair is it, in order to maintain a specific charge against him, not to quote his precise words, but either to quote his words in such an order as will suit our purpose or to adopt words of our own and attribute them directly to him, or as exhibiting what we conceive to be his real opinions.

Again; when a controversialist is bringing home his charge

against a writer whose opinions he has been combating, it appears to me unreasonable to apply the author's language to a condition of things different from that in connection with which the words were originally used. If the writer's object was to propound his views, or to tender his advice to parties placed in certain circumstances, it appears to me contrary to all the rules of fair reasoning to apply his observations to parties placed in circumstances entirely different. It is, moreover, much more fair, much more in accordance with the dictates of christian charity, to judge of a clergyman by his parochial or official acts than by his writings as an editor. The former elicit his inborn, deep, and decided opinions; the latter, in dealing with controverted points, in meeting aspersion and combating falsehood, must necessarily exhibit some changing phases. All is settled and serene in the first case; in the other it is tossed upon turbulent waters.

Now, sir, perhaps I shall be able to convince those of your readers who take an interest in this correspondence that the above remarks are, in no inconsiderable degree, applicable to the Rev. Mr. Brough's fourth point, which bears the significant title of "Tractarianism."

1. The Oxford Tracts. It should be remembered that these publications were in the first instance begotten by the assaults upon the Irish church, and the desire so strongly expressed in and out of parliament to abridge her revenue. A few earnest men—chiefly members of the University of Oxford—thought the best safeguard of the church under her difficulties would be to expound her principles, and especially to set forth her claims as a divine institution. Ignorance upon these points was believed to be the cause why these aggressions upon the church were in many quarters unresisted. When therefore the first volume appeared—exhibiting in a few popular tracts the church in her true light—there was very general approbation of the intention of these writers and their manner of carrying it out. Many men even of evangelical sentiments, not only found no fault with them, but hailed them as an augury of good. They were accordingly thus noticed in the *Church* newspaper of August 24, 1839. "In giving so high a character, in general to these publications, we beg most distinctly to be understood as not pledging ourselves to an unqualified approval of all that has emanated from those profound scholars, and eminently pious men. The Oxford Tracts have an apparent tendency to some few doctrines which we deem erroneous, and which we believe are so held by the soundest of our Protestant Divines,—they are also occasionally disfigured by some expressions and sentiments which, to say the least, we consider of questionable lawfulness, and most decidedly inexpedient. Making, however, these deductions, we

debating, it appears to a condition of which the words were propound his views, in circumstances, reasoning to apply is entirely different. in accordance with clergyman by his is an editor. The ons; the latter, in sion and combat- g phases. All er it is tossed upon

ose of your readers the above remarks
Rev. Mr. Brough's "Tractarianism." bered that these the assaults upon ressed in and out nest men—chiefly the best safeguard expound her prin- divine institution. be the cause why quarters unresisted. hibiting in a few e was very general d their manner of l sentiments, not n as an augury of he *Church* news- h a character, in ctly to be under- d approval of all s, and eminently tendency to some ch we believe are es,—they are also entiments which, fulness, and most deduc- tions, we

regard the champions of the Oxford Theology as men who have restored many a half-buried and forgotten truth to a prominence and importance to which they have too long been strangers."

In the *Church* of October 19, 1839, the article appeared from which Mr. Brough has made his quotation; and it was evidently written in consequence of the many puerile and ignorant attacks which were made upon these writings—and most of these by persons who had never read the Tracts, and perhaps very little theology at all. To such as these it was recommended by the editor of the *Church* to read the Tracts for themselves.

But I may repeat that at this time the Oxford Tracts were, in general estimation, comparatively harmless. Only a small portion of them had as yet been published; and it was not until some time after that the most offensive and insidious numbers appeared. Bishop Bagot, for example, expressed himself approvingly of them at first, but on the publication of No. 90, he desired their discontinuance.

In the earlier numbers referred to in the extract above given, there was certainly nothing to indicate a tendency to Rome. On the contrary, in one of those earlier publications, the following expressions occur: "Alas with them (the Papists) a union is impossible. Their communion is infected with heresy. We are bound to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God's truth: and by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed. They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed; it cannot be reformed."

When the Oxford Tract writers used such language as this, it was natural to believe them sincere; and, regarding them as sincere, it would have been hard and uncharitable to stigmatize them as abettors of Popery. What they would afterwards prove it was difficult to foresee; the fairest course was to treat them as we found them.

It was very evident that no feeling existed in the breast of any of the clergy then, that the editor of the *Church* favoured opinions which were likely to lead to the overthrow or corruption of the Protestant faith. In the summer of 1841, on resigning that office, it was, I believe, unanimously resolved by the clergy, in visitation assembled at Toronto, to present Dr. Bethune with a testimonial indicative of the great and important service he had rendered the church in the management of that journal. And I shall be corrected if I am wrong in saying that that resolution was shared in by the Rev. Mr. Brough himself. At the close of the year 1842, it was presented by a deputation in behalf of the clergy, consisting of the Rev. H. J. Grassett, the Rev. R. D. Cartwright, and the Rev. H. Scadding. Subsequently to this period the "Tracts

for the *Times*" having been suppressed, were rarely referred to; and after his resumption of these editorial duties in 1843, it will be hard to show that Archdeacon Bethune ever even mentioned these publications, much less expressed himself in approbation of them.

Now, I ask have I not a fair ground of complaint as to the use which the Rev. Mr. Brough has made of his extract from the editorial articles of the *Church* paper. They only refer to a small number of the "Tracts for the *Times*," but Mr. Brough comments upon them in such a strain as to induce your readers to suppose that all the Tracts indiscriminately were approved of by the editor of the *Church*, and all regarded by him as valuable additions to our theological literature. Because the editor was sufficiently polite to acknowledge the receipt of the first numbers from the publisher, because he designated some of those who assailed these numbers as "Tyros in theological learning," because in reviewing them he did not deny that these first numbers contained much truth, because he spoke of their authors as "distinguished divines of a Protestant and learned university," therefore he is a Tractarian; and all this in the face of the guarded editorial notice taken of them in the first quotation I have given, which, as your readers will observe, by no means expresses an unqualified approval of their contents. Sir, it will not do. His reasoning on these quotations is utterly, radically unsound.

Again: the recommendation "to peruse the Tracts for themselves, &c." given by the editor to those unacquainted with the Tractarian controversy, Mr. Brough, drawing largely upon his imagination, and calculating largely upon the credulity of your readers, supposes to be addressed by the Archdeacon to an assemblage, lay and clerical, in St. Paul's Church, London, and from this supposition he insinuates the probability of erroneous teaching. Now, Mr. Editor, let not an inference, founded upon an imaginary case, be accepted, and one founded upon a real case be objected. Dr. Bethune has already published several charges. What erroneous sentiments are deducible from them? Would Mr. Brough consider the following expressed in his charge of 1855, a proof of any bias towards Rome?

"Our Lord's own teaching and appointments show that the work of devotional duty is not to be overburdened by undue ceremonial, nor its spirit crushed beneath an overpowering weight of material covering. Where there is too much of material dress upon religion—where the work of devotion is mixed up with an undue preponderence of ceremonies and forms; the mind and spirit become, as we may say, materialised; the thoughts and feelings acquire, as it were, a corporeal grossness; there is a sensuality and earthiness engendered in the affections thus employed. This is but

ly referred to; and in 1843, it will be mentioned these probation of them. Iant as to the use extract from the only refer to a small Brough comments leaders to suppose of by the editor of the additions to our sufficiently polite to om the publisher, d these numbers as ewing them he did h truth, because he es of a Protestant rian; and all this of them in the first will observe, by no contents. Sir, it s utterly, radically

sets for themselves, with the Tractarian his imagination, r readers, supposes age, lay and cleris supposition he Now, Mr. Editor, case, be accepted, Dr. Bethune has al- bous sentiments are der the following as towards Rome? s show that the ardened by undu rpowering weight of material dress ed up with an un- mind and spirit ghts and feelings s a sensuality and yed. This is but

natural, where the eye and ear, for instance, are too exclusively engaged; impressions in this case play around the senses, and stop short there; the inner man is not thoroughly reached, the inner life is not adequately affected. We find in the countries and amongst the people where it prevails, much outward devotion, and much time spent in the work; but the inward soul and life appears not to be correspondingly affected; there is but a playing as it were with the sympathies and passions of the sensual nature. We have, indeed, but to look at the moral condition of Italy and Spain, in comparison with that of our own favored mother country, to be assured of the fact, that the tendency of their system of religion is to leave the inner man comparatively untouched, and centralize religion in mere animal emotion. Superstition is the necessary consequence; and that easy, but dangerous credulity, which assumes that a penance can atone for a crime, and that the priest's word can assure a pardon."

Now, Sir, do these sentiments—during the delivery of which from the pulpit of St. Paul's Church, Mr. Brough, if I mistake not, was present—argue a bias towards Rome? Mr. Brough pictures to himself Dr. Bethune delivering an Episcopal charge, and recommending a perusal of the Tracts for the Times, and then he asks, "would not one universal cry pronounce aha! our eye hath seen it,"—i. e. Tractarianism. But here, Sir, is no imaginary case but a case of actual occurrence, in which the Romish ceremonial is condemned, and the vast superiority of Protestantism, not only as a system of spiritual religion, but also as a system of morality, is proved from Scripture reason, and the undeniable evidence of facts. What then shall be the universal cry? Sir, let not the shadow have more influence in awakening our distrust than the substance in establishing our confidence. Let not a man's imagination assert a supremacy over his better judgment. Let not pre-conceived opinions shut up every avenue to conviction. Let evenhanded justice be extended to all; and let the universal cry be—for its propriety is unquestionable—these are not the sentiments of a Romanizing Tractarian or a Puseyite; this is sound Protestantism; no phantom has deluded us, but our eyes have seen it and our ears have heard it.

Your readers will have the kindness to bear with me if I beg their attention to another brief extract from the same charge indicative of Dr. Bethune's freedom from the peculiarities which distinguish what is called the Tractarian School.

"There would be modes in worship and rules for conducting the business of the sanctuary, which, prevalent as they may have been in the primitive times, and conducive then, in the judgment of the

church, to regularity and discipline, present views and modern customs, would render not only inexpedient but undeniably. Many things indeed, adopted in the Apostle's days, were soon dropped from the abuse to which, from human infirmity or the shifting phases of society, they became subject. I need but instance the feast of charity, the kiss of peace, and some subordinate offices in the church—that of deaconesses for example—which it was soon found inexpedient to retain. And it would be as difficult, and as unwise, to restore such customs now; as well as to re-establish certain acts of discipline, or re-introduce peculiar practices in divine worship, which, though they may have been sanctioned by mediæval or even primitive usage, have doubtless, in most cases, fallen into disuse from the impossibility of maintaining them with any hope of edification or spiritual benefit."

2. I now come to the quotation which the Rev. Mr. Brough has made—or rather which he has professed to make—(for as I shall show, it is not an accurate extract)—from the writings of Dr. Bethune, and which he contrasts with the teaching of the 19th and 20th articles of the Church. I may mention that it ought to have been the 19th and 21st articles; fortunately for his own cause he has not alluded to the 20th article. Now Mr. Brough has committed a mistake in marking the passage referring to the authority of "General Councils, &c.," as an extract quotation, as your readers will note by carefully examining the following passages from an article of the *Church* paper of January 15, 1847.

"It is about disputed points that the testimony of the church is chiefly employed. There are certain matters regarding which the voice of Scripture is misunderstood: with respect to certain doctrines the language of revelation presents itself to different individuals with different meanings. Here private judgment is at fault; for if men will follow no guide but their own discernment—and the discernment of one is opposed in its results to the same faculty in another—it is impossible that there should be any agreement. The church here interferes, and strives to ensure unity by delivering her opinion upon the matter in dispute. The decision of any particular church must coincide with the judgment of the church universal; otherwise if it oppose the general voice of Christians in the early and pure ages of Christianity—as the Church of Rome does in the corruptions which have grown upon that uncatholic communion—our submission to it cannot be exacted. But where the church universal has recorded its conclusions, and laid down its interpretation of the Holy Scriptures so positively that there can be no further obscurity or doubt in the canons of General Councils, and the writings of large numbers of primitive divines, a decision of this kind

cannot be
grave of
authority

Does
the 20th
of faith.
sinful ra
of this a
be it obs
universa
primitiv
simple i
opinion,
thing wh
settle it.

Mr. B
and dev
no doubt
to unsou
grounded
the way
would tr
in even a
cited con
21st artic
takes th
historical
to the re
contradic
Should t
another

"We
God is t
of his w
ever dec
enough
be comp
appointm

Mr. B
Protesta
readers
them to
what pri
them to

s and modern customs and denying. Many were soon dropped by or the shifting but instance the coordinate offices in which it was soon as difficult, and as as to re-establish practices in divine mentioned by medi- most cases, fallen ng them with any

ev. Mr. Brough has e—(for as I shall he writings of Dr. ing of the 19th and hat it ought to have his own cause he Brough has coming to the authority tion, as your readers g passages from an 7.

ny of the church is regarding which the spect to certain doc- to different individ- judgment is at fault; scernment—and the the same faculty in ny agreement. The unity by delivering decision of any par- ent of the church uni- e of Christians in the church of Rome does in t uncatholic commu- But where the church down its interpreta- ere can be no further councils, and the wri- decision of this kind

cannot be set aside, we conceive, without the commission of a very grave offence. It is authority beyond question; for if it were not authority, the neglect of it would be no sin."

Does anything in these observations go beyond the assertion of the 20th article, that "The church hath authority in controversies of faith." And if it be conceded that she has, would it not be sinful rashly to impugn it? And what can be safer than the ground of this authority, as explained in the above quotation? It is not, be it observed, yielded to a single church, but to the voice of the universal church; it is limited to that voice as expressed in the primitive days of Christianity; and it is narrowed down to the simple interpretation of Scripture, admitting no new dogma or opinion, but adopting the word of God as the basis, and only settling what the word of God means as far as human judgment can settle it.

Mr. Brough, I presume, reads the Common Prayer *ex animo*, and devoutly believes in the Apostle and Nicene Creeds. He would, no doubt, regard it as a grave offence to hear these creeds assailed as unsound. And yet they are the compilation of the church—grounded certainly on the Word of God, but yet its own opinion of the way in which that word should be interpreted. And those who would treat them contemptuously, he would be disposed to address in even stronger terms of rebuke than the editorial article above cited conveys. And thus Mr. Brough's citation of the 19th and 21st articles is far from the question. The above editorial article takes the Holy Scripture as the groundwork, and appeals to the historical testimony of the church only where there is a doubt as to the real meaning of the Scripture. But it does not affirm—in contradiction to the 19th article—that churches have not erred. Should there be any further doubt upon this point, let me make another brief quotation from the *Church* paper of Feb. 26, 1847.

"We never maintained that every source of instruction of which God is the author, and connected by God with the written record of his will, is infallible. It is highly improbable that we should ever declare anything half so absurd. For if we were inconsiderate enough to make this unadvised assertion, we should, in that case, be compelled to go the length of saying that a ministry of divine appointment is infallible."

Mr. Brough regards this as a contest for the integrity of our Protestant Church. But, Sir, my reverend friend must give your readers credit for the possession of sufficient discernment to enable them to judge between assertion and proof; and, when it is asked what principle of Protestantism has been assailed, he must permit them to share in the decision of the question.

The zeal which your correspondent manifests for the Protestantism of the church, the holy ardor for its maintenance which he evinces in the strongly expressed hope that the church in this land may be preserved from apostacy and from the fallacies and wiles of Tractarianism, should elicit the warmest approval of all who value the principles of the reformation, and who desire that those principles may be transmitted inviolate to their posterity for ever. The unscriptural and uncatholic dogmas of the Romish communion against which, at the era of the reformation a solemn protest was recorded in the liturgy and articles of the Anglican church, must be carefully guarded against and unceasingly opposed. But let the weapons of our warfare be those of which we need never be ashamed, viz. Scripture, reason, and the testimony of the church in the earliest and purest ages. By using these weapons it was that the immortal martyrs of the church achieved her reformation. It was thus they rescued for us from amidst a mass of error, the heritage of "the faith which was once delivered to the saints." It was thus they drew the conclusion that, upon certain points of doctrine, Rome had erred from the truth, and that, from time to time, during the lapse of 1000 years, she had added many new dogmas to the simple faith of Christ. When in assailing the errors of Rome, we appeal mainly to popular prejudice, or deal only in denunciation, it must be evident to reflecting men that in reality we are giving Rome the advantage, and that we are far from doing adequate justice to the strength of our cause.

This letter sir, has, I fear, exhausted the patience of your readers, and I must hasten to a conclusion. Mr. Brough, has insinuated that Dr. Bethune has put forth views on the Eucharist at variance with the teaching of the church. I took the liberty to deny the charge, and to ask for the evidence. The *onus probandi* rests with him, and when he enters on the proof, I shall be happy to give it my attention.

E. PATTERSON.

Stratford, May 26, 1857.

THE MAIN FACTS OF THE COBOURG ALTAR CASE.

A few gentlemen expressed a wish to make an offering to the new Church, and proposed a carved altar-table. They ordered it from the United States, without, taking the precaution of showing Dr. Bethune the patterns they designed to adopt. The carvings were a ladder, sponge, rope, &c., and were screwed on the table

for the Protestantism
ce which he evinces
in this land may be
and wiles of Tract-
all who value the prin-
those principles may
er. The unscriptural
nion against which
was recorded in the
, must be carefully
it let the weapons of
ashamed, viz. Scrip-
in the earliest and
that the immortal
n. It was thus they
the heritage of "the
" It was thus they
of doctrine, Rome
to time, during the
ogmas to the simple
of Rome, we appeal
enunciation, it must
we are giving Rome
; adequate justice to

ence of your readers,
ough, has insinuated
Eucharist at variance
e liberty to deny the
probandi rests with
I be happy to give it

PATTERSON.

ALTAR CASE.
an offering to the
e. They ordered it
eauation of showing
ept. The carvings
rewed on the table

At first many saw it and approved of it, amongst others not a few Irish members of the Congregation. Discussion gradually took place regarding it, and the result was, that some persons entered the Church at night, and removed the carvings. Dr. Bethune was at Quebec at the time. When he returned the sense of the Congregation was taken on the subject, and both the Rector and the Congregation almost unanimously came to the conclusion that it was most wise to remove it. Dr. Bethune always publicly stated, that if consulted at the outset, he would have recommended a plain tablet, although he considered the carvings perfectly harmless, as such emblems are constantly exhibited on stained windows without exciting objection or distrust. Yet as no principle was involved, and for the sake of peace he was quite willing that it should be removed. Many of his most attached parishioners are Irish gentlemen, of whom there is not one who would not affirm that he is a sound Protestant.

OUR FUTURE BISHOP! WHOM WE SHOULD CHOOSE?

To the Editor of the London Free Press.

SIR,—Is the Rev. Mr. Brough a self-constituted champion, or is he merely the exponent and mouthpiece of *him* who *nolens volens*, and *usque ad nauseum* is endeavouring to raise himself to be the head of our See, and who, if report speaks true, stands behind the scenes, guiding with his councils and furnishing with his arguments his changeable, inconsistent and imprudent friend? is the question which we laity ask of one another, when we read the long, the verbose, and the discursive effusions with which the Rev. gentleman has lately favoured the public, on the momentous Episcopal subject.

It is a question, however, which like a great many others that have been lately asked, will I suppose never be answered. Those who feel an interest in the Episcopal duel, are no doubt amused at the adroit manner with which the Rev. gentleman endeavours to throw on his adversaries, the onus "as to who threw the first stone, in that absence of moderation, and freedom from personalities," which eminently characterizes the clerical discussion going on at present. They have, no doubt, observed, that he commences and concludes every letter with which he has wearied us, with the responsibility, &c., &c., which rest on those who have commenced the controversy. In the last issue of the *Prototype*, he even has devoted a whole letter to the subject, and condescends to strengthen his arguments

by quoting an opinion long ago expressed on the point by *him* whose public and private character he has assailed in a manner which must elicit the disapprobation and disappointment of many who thought that Mr. Brough possesses a different disposition.

But we are all blind to our own faults, even the oldest of us. "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye," is the text which I would respectfully suggest to the Rev. gentlemen for his next sermon. In the heat of his arguments, and the violence of his animosity against Dr. Bethune's doctrinal tenets Mr. Brough seems *wholly* and *totally* to have forgotten and *completely* to have overlooked the necessity that others, besides himself, who are yet ignorant of them, are to be made acquainted with the qualifications of his "favourite."

Instead of assailing the modest, peaceful and Christian circular issued by the friends of the Archdeacon of York, first, with a tirade of abuse and personalities unworthy of such a cause, and then endeavouring to palliate the conscientious feeling he must now have, as to his conduct in the eyes of the public, by making it appear that it was very disagreeable, but still a duty, that he would have gladly escaped from, viz: the necessity of expressing himself unfavourably towards Dr. Bethune, and that the responsibility must rest with those who provoked the controversy. Is such conduct manly? Is such a subterfuge generous?

Would not the public have been more pleased, more satisfied and more enlightened, by the Rev. Mr. Brough laying before them, a modest, peaceful and Christian statement of the claims which he deems his friend to possess in so pre-eminent a degree? But is it modesty, a conscientious inability, or a moral impossibility to do so, which have prevented him in all his letters from making even the slightest allusion to the merits of, or from instituting a comparison between his "candidate" and the Archdeacon of York?

It matters but little to us, whether the clergy do, or do not abstain from unseemly personalities; if they choose to have recourse to such means as have the effect only of lowering their respective candidates with themselves in the estimation of their flocks, it is their own affair: the main question at issue, and which we are at present to consider is, "whom *should* we choose?" "And whom *should* we *not* choose?" The Archdeacon of York, or the Rev. Mr. Brough's "favorite;" which of these two clergymen has been so zealous, conscientious and efficient in the discharge of his parochial duties, and in his ministerial conduct so eminently possesses those Christian merits and moral virtues, which we all would look forward to as indispensable requisites in him who is to preside over the

future de
preference
With t
tant poin
under the
That lett
years, a l
don has b
reviewed
career of
twenty-fi
his condu
his paris
the afee
retain; v
entrusted
Bishop, w
were, on
his real i
ference t
workings
have bee
into the
become i
lence spe
to be dai
te, and a
two-thir
Is it p
the leng
of his m
high and
cannot
Brough,
even one
exagger
gates" t
able mo
for the
satirical
motto in
ipse pe
before w
our stee

point by him whose manner which must many who thought

n. in the oldest of us thine own eye; and out of thy brother's suggest to the Rev. his arguments, and ne's doctrinal tenets forgotten and com- ers, besides himself, acquainted with the

Christian circular, first, with a tirade cause, and then en- he must now have, by making it appear that he would have lessing himself unfa- responsibility must

. Is such conduct

, more satisfied and ing before them, a e claims which he degree? But is it possibility to do so, in making even the uting a comparison of York?

rgy do, or do not use to have recourse ing their respective t their flocks, it is d which we are at e?" "And whom k, or the Rev. Mr. ymen has been so ge of his parochial tly possesses those would look forward to preside over the

future destinies of the Western Diocese, as to entitle him to the preference?

With the view of eliciting information and truth on this important point, a letter was inserted in your columns of the 6th ult., under the head of "Our New Bishop—who should not be chosen?" That letter was written by one who is still and has been for many years, a living witness to the manner in which the Parish of London has been, and is at this present moment worked. In it were reviewed the mode of ministry which has characterized the clerical career of the Rev. Mr. Brough's "favorite candidate," for the twenty-five years he has been resident in it; the influence which his conduct, example, exhortations and teachings have had amongst his parishioners;—the fruits which his labours have wrought;—the affection and esteem which he once gained, but could not retain; with the express view of suggesting to those to whom is entrusted the grave and important duty of the election of our Bishop, the necessity which they ought to possess, of *pausing* as it were, *on the threshold* before they, perchance, through ignorance of his real merits, could so far stultify themselves as to give the preference to one whose charge has been so important, and yet whose workings have been so unprofitable; whose apathy and indifference have been so great, that they have driven many of his parishioners into the ranks of Dissent, which through his instrumentality has become rife. An answer has been looked for, but in vain. "Silence speaks consent," is an old adage so familiar and conclusive as to be daily in the mouths of most of us, that it is justly applicable to, and answers the "Western Layman" in a satisfactory manner, two-thirds of the attendants at St. Paul's Church, cannot deny.

Is it possible, then, that he whose name has been held up through the length and breadth, not only of this his adopted, but in those of his mother country, as the only fit and proper person to fill that high and elevated post, to which we all would look with reverence, cannot find one friend, one kind friend, not even the Rev. Mr. Brough, who will dare to stand up in his defence and say, that even one of the ministerial failings depicted in that letter has been exaggerated? Is there no one to tell the "Clergy and Lay Delegates" that it has been his maxim *ever* to abstain from all questionable money operations? No one to deny that so sordid is his love for the "mammon of unrighteousness," that the inimitable and satirical Juvenal has given his armorial bearings an appropriate motto in the well-known quotation "*crescit amor nummi quantum ipse pecunia crescit*," and that the valuable time given by Him, before whose knee we shall all yet bow, and "give an account of our stewardship," and as Paul says, "For we brought nothing into

this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out," instead of being spent in attending to the spiritual wants of his numerous, neglected and needy parishioners, has been occupied in the amassment of wealth, in "buying, selling and speculating."

Amongst those who so staunchly support and so warmly admire him, cannot he find one to say that he possesses that meek, mild, forgiving, conciliatory and *controllable* temper, which we all would look forward to as requisite in him who is to be our Bishop ?

Will no one come forward and deny the statement, that his exhortations and teachings are so little prized, that the attendants at his weekly lectures are few and far between, and composed chiefly of those who have recently arrived in London, and consequently *know him not* ?

Is there no one to deny, that numbers of his neglected parishioners have not, and are not still leaving his church, and seeking throughout the city, other and more congenial places of worship ?

Is not the silence, then, which has followed the footsteps of the "Western Layman," remarkable ? Is it not ominous ? Does it not carry with it an admission of a conscious inability and a moral impossibility of a contradiction ? Are the questions he has asked and the statements he has made, to be considered harsh and unwarrantable ? or are they truthful, warrantable and unanswerable ? And if so, what ought to be the conclusion made, and the inferences drawn in the mind of the thoughtful Christian ?

Would he wish to see him who has spent the whole of a long ministry in pursuits totally irreconcileable and at variance with those of a zealous, conscientious, earnest and pious minister of the Gospel ; would he, I say, deem him worthy of the high honor, which only those who really do not enter into a proper consideration of, and consult the real interests of our beloved Church, would wish to see vested in him ?

How can one who has so seriously, so grievously, and for such a length of time, neglected the duties of a parish priest, that Dissent has crept in, and become rife, where resistance through an *efficient* ministry, would have been amply sufficient to have kept her out, perform with *efficiency*, the responsible, the difficult and the solemn duties of a Diocesan ?

Can one who, by "apathy, hauteur, indifference and neglect" has estranged their affections and driven many from the ranks of Episcopacy, can, I say, such a one be deemed worthy of an Episcopate ?

Can one who does not stand immaculate, who has imbibed fully of its poison and in his daily actions has so well personified that plague spot of the age, "buying, selling, and speculating ?" is he who has sacrificed at the shrine of the "God of Mammon" the

precious and valuable time given by Him who says "By their fruits shall ye know them" to be deemed a "fit and proper person" to occupy that post to which we all would look with reverence?

Is such the career, which is likely to inspire the minds of the clergy and laity with feelings of reverence, respect, and esteem? Are such the antecedents so well and so generally known throughout his parish, which are likely to create any impression for, add any impetus to, advance the interests of our beloved Church in particular, and the cause of religion in general?

In short *what* can his qualifications be? *Why or how* can he be chosen over *him*, whose moral virtues, Christian merits, ministerial conduct, parochial workings, conjoined with many other indispensable qualifications, stand *unimpeachable*.

I beg to remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

A "WESTERN LAYMAN."

May 22nd, 1857.

A CALVINISTIC *versus* SCRIPTURAL AND PRAYER
BOOK BISHOP.

To the Editor of the London Prototype.

SIR,—Amongst the most singular and beautiful evidences that the Catholic faith, and *it alone*, emanates from the infinite excellence, is its ennobling effects upon those who truly receive it, and on the other hand, that immediate lowering of the moral tone which is almost invariably consequent upon any measure of departure from it. Whether it be Calvanism, Popery, Quakerism, or Spiritualism, &c., &c., by which Christian men become unhappily influenced, each will be found after its own fashion, to degrade the appreciation of Gospel virtue and evangelical simplicity and truthfulness.

It is only thus I can account for that want of fairness, simplicity, and brotherly candour which I deeply regret to see characterises, too generally, the calvinistic portion of our brethren in the present Episcopal controversy; and that to such a degree, that it has more than once elicited the indignant remarks of the secular press. The writers are, some of them, at least, men of gentlemanly feeling, kind hearts, and, I doubt not, in the main, Christian principle; alas! then, that their fine gold should be so dimmed by the dress of calvinistic bitterness and spiritual self-exaltation, as to cause them to adopt a deceptive and ungenerous controversial course, only

to be defended by the fearful Jesuital dogma, that "the end justifies the means."

The Rev. C. C. Brough, in his answer to the Rev. E. Patterson, has, it pains me to say, acted thus disingenuously; in the following particulars:—

1st. He reiterates the charge that we, Dr. Bethune's supporters, commenced personalities; without so much as alluding to the *positive proofs to the contrary* which I gave him in a late number of the *Free Press*, and which I took particular pains to send to every clergyman and lay delegate in the west, and otherwise extensively to circulate.

2nd. He again produces, also at great length, the charge of "Tractarianism," although it is a mere baseless slander, if by that cant term any traitorous leaning to the unhallowed errors of the Papacy is meant to be implied. Here, also, he entirely ignores the answer which I had given in the above-named paper, and which with your permission, I will repeat; it was as follows:

"What do we say to Dr. Bethune's defence of the Tracts for the *Times*, &c.? Simply this, that he must have been a traitor to the Church not to have rejoiced to see the vigorous defence which the first numbers of those Tracts made of the doctrines of the Gospel as ever taught in the Primitive and Reformed Anglican Church. The Church of England had been, ever since the great Puritan rebellion, more or less afflicted with the incubus of calvinistic error; awfully dishonoring God by teaching that he formed the vast majority of the human race to be inevitably damned; practically trampling upon the blood of Christ and contradicting the blessed Gospel, by holding that he did not "taste death for every man," but only for a secret number, by calvinists falsely called the "elect." Calvinism had also done much to drive Christ out of His own church, by treating the ordinances instituted by Himself as 'beggarly elements'; these and many other false doctrines and sore practical evils had this deadly error brought upon the church; hence every true believer in the teaching of the Prayer-book rejoiced to see earnest and learned men at Oxford trying once more to reform the church, and bring her back to her own Prayer-book again; but when some of these Tract writers began themselves to wander from the pure simplicity of the Gospel, and uphold many of the dangerous errors of Romanism; then, the Archdeacon, with other sound churchmen, both at home and here, refused any longer to have anything to do with the Tractarians! Thus did Dr. Bethune defend the 'Tracts' so long as they defended the doctrines of the Church of England, but not one hour longer!"

"Now, my brethren, is it not strange that such plain and Scriptural conduct, and such holy wisdom as this should be brought as a charge against the Archdeacon? Does it not look as if those who bring such charges do themselves cling to the unscriptural and dangerous errors of calvinism, opposed as they are to the plain teaching of the Prayer-book; and are angry with Dr. Bethune and his supporters that they will not do the same, but depart alike from Rome and Geneva?"

By looking over Mr. Brough's letter again, your readers will see that he admits the truth of the above statement, that it was only the *first portion* of the "Tracts for the Times" that Dr. Bethune sanctioned; hence, by *Mr. Brough's own admission*, it is clear that when the "Tracts" began, in any measure, to forsake the doctrines of the Prayer-book, Archdeacon Bethune forsook them.

3rd. The real sin of Archdeacon Bethune, and of his supporters, in the eyes of Mr. Brough, and Dr. Cronyn's friends generally, is simply this:—**THAT WE ARE NOT CALVINISTS!** Let this fact be fairly understood. With all other honest churchmen, Dr. Bethune and his friends believe the 17th article, perhaps more fully than our calvinistic brethren; but, thank God, it does not teach Calvinism any more than do the Baptismal, the Confirmation, the Communion, and the Ordination services. With the Bible and the Prayer-book in our hands, we cannot, as honest men, however, do other than believe also that Christ Jesus tasteth death for *every* man; that *all* therefore may be saved; yea, and that wherever the visible Church of Christ is found, there *all* have the blessed opportunity afforded them of becoming the *elect* of God; and we further believe that in order to salvation good works must be brought forth by us, as the lively fruits of an earnest and right faith; and that the surest method of being thus enabled "to walk in Christ Jesus," is the diligent, penitent, and believing use of those ordinances which Christ has himself established. But for holding these blessed and Gospel truths, in which the Church of Christ has ever rejoiced, we are called by the calvinistic portion of the church—*unevangelical!* Again I repeat, therefore, openly and in the face of the whole Canadian Church, that the present contest, as to who shall fill the Western Episcopate, is NOT (as Mr. Brough and his friends would have the Church believe) whether we shall have a Protestant or a Puseyistic Bishop! Oh! no, thank God, the sound Protestantism of Archdeacon Bethune is beyond all question.

The *true* controversy is then simply—whether we shall have a *Calvinistic* Bishop, who will substitute a narrow and bitterly uncharitable theology, for that of the *all-prevailing efficacy* of the blood of Christ; or a *true son of the Reformed Anglican Church*, who, in

the spirit of the Gospel and the Prayer-book, will, with genuine Protestantism, guard the flock of Christ, committed to his care, against the God-dishonouring and soul endangering errors of Popery, calvinism, and every other form of heresy !

This, and this alone, is the true point at issue as regards the calvinistic or Low Church party; for *ourselves*, in addition to sound doctrine, we seek a Bishop distinguished by earnest labor, clean hands, and a pure heart !

4th. Alas ! again, for Calvinistic Jesuitism ! What means Mr. Brough's insinuation that we are so doubtful of Dr. Bethune's election, that we are thinking of substituting another candidate in his place ? Oh, alas ! alas ! it grieves me to think he must, he does, know better !

I have spoken plainly, for Christianity is truth—the “ truth in love ”—not bitterness and disingenuous subtlety, clothed in the abused words of Christian charity.

Yours truly,

ADAM TOWNLEY.

Paris, C. W., May 25, 1857.

From the Dundas Warden,

The choice, which will result from the votes of the Synod of the Western Diocese, is at this moment occupying the anxious thoughts and exciting the interest, not only of those within, but of many without the pale of the Protestant Church; and it is not erring to affirm, that all its branches, equally with the most exclusive churchman, will partake in a measure alike of the fruits of its future deliberations.

Let us hope that the object to be sought, and the prize to be gained, can be traced to higher feelings than those of mere partizanship. Let us believe that, not personal interest, but higher motives prevail, and if not all, at least the majority of those who have taken up their pens in order to guide public opinion in the proper channel, are prompted by a sense of duty, and by the desire to aid in the better establishment of those noble and religious principles which we ought all to observe.

We may ask, then, what are the qualifications which ought to mark the selection of a Bishop ?

If he be a man actuated by high principles; if his life has been characterized by a pure and unblemished course; if he possesses the talent and ability to carry out his views—that he enjoys an immense amount of influence for good, is easy of comprehension.

genuine
is care,
Popery,
wards the
to sound
r, clean
means Mr.
ethune's
dicate in
must, he
truth in
d in the
NLEY.
nod of the
s thoughts
it of many
not erring
exclusive
uits of its
prize to be
mere parti-
out higher
those who
nion in the
the desire
gious prin-
ch ought to
fe has been
e possesses
joys an im-
ension.

He, therefore, should possess purity of life, a blameless and irreproachable character, ability, learning, eminent Christian piety, command of temper, foresight, energy, simplicity of living, charity, hospitality, perseverance, administrative ability, sound common sense, and vigour of mind; the example of his life, and the tone of his thoughts, should penetrate into the remotest corners of his diocese, so that even those who seldom see him may be imperceptibly affected, to an extent of which they themselves may be unconscious. His opinions should have all the weight which position can give, and his example should be quoted as an authority.

Radiating from a centre, his views, his zeal, his devotion, his purity of life, should extend from those who constantly surround him, and consequently taking much of their tone from him to the country clergy, and through them to the laity, thus then grows up an identity of thought, which, disseminated through the wide area of his labours, must necessarily engender a better spirit and nobler aspirations.

Thus, the government of the Church means the government of public morality, the better inculcation of duty, the establishment of sound religious teaching. Let us see whether this standard can be attained by either of those whose names have been brought forward as eligible for the high office, or must we seek a choice elsewhere?

Much has lately been said and written by the respective friends of the two clergymen to whom I allude, viz., the Venerable Archdeacon of York, and the Rector of London. A careful study of their past life, their ministry, attainments, and character, both public and private, must lead to vastly different conclusions in the minds of the neutral and unprejudiced.

While the friends of the former have uttered nothing disparaging in the slightest degree to the London candidate, those of the latter have assailed the Archdeacon of York in a manner to be regretted for their own sakes. Such a proceeding is contrary, not only to good taste, but it is characterised by a disingenuousness in every way to be condemned. In this case, however, as it generally happens, the blow has recoiled on those who gave it, for, in point of personal character, Dr. Bethune is above cavil, beloved in his parish, careless of money, faithful and active in his ministry, gentle and unaffected, mild and distinguished, not only for learning, but for the soundness and moderateness of his views. We believe that it is impossible for a clergyman to be more popular, whereas the contrary is said to be the case with the Rector of London.

In his vestry have taken place the most stormy and angry meetings in the Province. It is notorious that constant disputes have taken place between him and his congregation, and to such an

extent has his ministry been neglected, that the secessions from his church have built up other houses of worship, leaving his own church in London, the sole building in the Township possessed by the Anglican communicants.

Not long since, a serious difficulty arose as to his right to the graveyard, which he claims as a portion of the glebe, notwithstanding that the concession was made *specially* by Sir John Colborne, in person, at London, to the Church. Through some mistake, however, the ground was included in the patent for the Rectory; this slight pretence, with that legal sagacity for which the Rector is famous, he has laid hold of, possession has been taken, portions of it have lately been fenced off, and unsightly buildings have been constructed upon it, crowding round and disfiguring the church. When respectfully remonstrated with, by members of his vestry, the courteous reply was, the ground was his, and that he would build up to the church windows if he thought proper.

Perhaps such a legal right might be asserted, were the income derived from the Rectory of London, small; such, however, is not the case. Besides, Dr. Cronyn is accused of being a land speculator. And while on this subject, we may add that there is a story of his operations relative to the purchase of a lot in London, known as the "Theatre Lot," which at all events, marks an amount of sharp practice, painful to observe in a clergyman. The subject was matter of discussion at a meeting in London,—as usual marked by much acrimony—therefore whatever may be the attainments of Dr. Cronyn, these circumstances at once predetermine our prepossession. For, however learned and eloquent a divine may be, it is evident that his opportunities for good are lessened to a *minimum* point, if he fails to carry with him the respect of those over whom he presides, and that he ought to be the last man in the Diocese who ought to be exalted to the important office.

On the other hand, in our poor judgment, we have in the character of the Venerable Archdeacon Bethune, the beau ideal, if we may be allowed the use of such a term, of a Bishop. In his spotless and unblemished life, his known learning and ability, his moderate opinions, his piety, and popularity with the clergy, his faithful, active and laborious parochial ministrations, the mildness and gentleness of his highly cultivated mind, conjoined with the tact, temper and discretion which have always marked the discharge of his Archdeaconal duties, we have positive arguments for pointing to him as eminently suited for the office. We conceive that the Delegates will not only perform an act of justice, by unanimously giving their recommendation to this "able and pure man," but they will in so doing, serve the interests of morality and their

church,—for in our humble opinion there is not the slightest comparison between the two men. One has the reputation of being worldly, a speculator, and an appropriator to his own use, of the property of his parish, in which general dissatisfaction and disunion reigns at the present moment to a lamentable extent. The other is a pure, good man, learned, modest, beloved in his parish, pious and devoted to letters, who would give dignity to the office, and would, we believe, set an example in his life, which would not fail to do good.

THE CHURCHWARDENS' REPLY TO THE *DUNDAS WARDER* ON THE SUBJECT OF THE NEW DIOCESE.

[We have been requested by the Churchwardens of St. Paul's to insert the following letter, with which request we have much pleasure in complying.—EDITOR FREE PRESS.]

To the Editor of the Dundas Warder.

SIR,—An Editorial article has lately appeared in your columns on the subject of the new Western Diocese, in which you strongly advocate the claims of Dr. Bethune to the Bishopric in opposition to those of Dr. Cronyn. Had the relative merits of the two candidates been placed before your readers in their true colours, no one could have complained, but when the character of the former is elevated at the expense of that of the latter, and a strong contrast drawn, founded on gross misrepresentation, it is time to undeceive you, and to point out where you have been misled by false reports.

You state that “the supporters of Dr. Cronyn have assailed Dr. Bethune in a manner to be regretted for their own sakes.” Were such the case, it could not militate against Dr. Cronyn, but would simply prove that some of his professed friends had more zeal than discretion; but Sir, we challenge you to produce a passage of any letter emanating from his supporters, in which the character of Dr. Bethune has been assailed in such a way as to warrant the violent personal attack made by you on Dr. Cronyn, based on a series of statements, as false as they are uncalled for.

We proceed to the agreeable task of refuting them, and can substantiate all our statements by evidence.

1. Your first charge is that “The most stormy vestry meetings in the Province have taken place in his church.” You must be well aware that it is in the power of a very few unquiet spirits to act in such a manner as to give a colouring to an accusation of this sort;—but the Minutes of the Vestry Book will show that the Churchwardens, not the Rector, have been the parties generally

assailed, while the large majorities, in well attended Vestry Meetings which have sustained their acts, and the annual re-election for fourteen consecutive years of the same person to the office of the people's Churchwarden may be taken as evidence as to the general feeling of the congregation. Indeed, the dissentients have found themselves in such a decided minority, that they have absented themselves from the last two Vestry Meetings, which were characterized by good feeling and unanimity.

2. "It is a matter of notoriety," you state, "that there have been constant disputes between the Rector and his congregation, to an extent that the secessions from his church have built up other forms of worship." The answer to the first part of this paragraph would only be a matter of our assertion against yours, but for the test which you have in the latter part proposed, and on which we can prove your statement false. We can refer again to the church books, to show that scarcely a pew-holder or seat-holder has resigned his pew or sitting in many years, while the number of members of other Christian denominations who have joined our communion, is by no means inconsiderable. For this fact the books are evidence, while it is patent to all that the free sittings are almost always filled.

3. "—— leaving his own church in London, the sole building in the Township possessed by the Anglican communicants." Such an assertion shows great ignorance of our statistics, (for we will not attribute the mistake to wrong motives). In addition to St. Paul's Church, London, there are in the Township, St. John's Church, built during our present Rector's incumbency of the adjoining Parish; St. George's and St. Mark's Churches, built during the incumbency of the Rev. Chas. C. Brough.

4. Respecting the ground upon which the church stands, you have been greatly misinformed. There can be no doubt that it is held by the Rector on the same tenure as the rest of the glebe, and as such he has no power alienate it. Some members of the congregation have questioned the original intention of this part of the grant, and have sought for evidence to prove that it was included in the patent "by mistake" as asserted by you. When such testimony is forthcoming, but not before, it will be time to call his claim to the possession of it a "slender pretence." In the mean time he has recently refused application to lease more of the land, because he did not wish to give offence to any of his congregation. As to the statement that the Rector declared "he would build up to the very church windows if he thought fit," we can only say that we never heard of his making such a threat;—that we do not believe it; and that his actions show no such intention.

5. compl
if a s
one c
and i
who h
him i
obtain
false?
makes
at an
came
rent, b
becam
offered
the pu
to the
on the
fully j
was pa

Wh
to free
friends
to assis
there i
by the
by the
Is this
Cronyn
some j
town,
but on
act of

Agai
lieve th
Cronyn
ly beyo
a dona
the act
to his c

6. m
matter
turn th

5. "Dr. Cronyn is accused of being a speculator in lands." You complain that Dr. Bethune is *accused* of being a Puseyite:—surely if a simple *accusation* is good ground for Dr. Cronyn's rejection in one case, it is equally so for Dr. Bethune's rejection in another: and if we are to have no Bishop till some one is brought forward, who has never been accused of anything that would militate against him if true, then it is to no purpose that the endowment has been obtained. Our labor is in vain. But is the accusation true or false? A speculator, according to our definition, is a person who makes a practice of buying lands for the purpose of selling them at an advance. That Dr. Cronyn has done so is untrue. When he came to reside in London, there being no Rectory, and few houses to rent, he purchased land and built on it. In process of time his land became very valuable, and when a Rectory was contemplated, he offered his house and a sufficient quantity of land to the Vestry for the purpose, at a price much below its value, and on very easy terms of payment. They gladly accepted it but some grumblers objecting to the purchase, he cheerfully took it back at the same price and on the same terms as he had sold it. His conduct in this matter fully justified the unanimous vote of thanks for his liberality which was passed by the Vestry.

When part of the glebe was sold under authority of a special Act, to free the church from debt, Dr. Cronyn, in common with all the friends of the church, made purchases to the extent of his means, to assist in carrying out this object. So little of *speculation* was there in this, that a number of the lots then sold were thrown up by the purchasers, and it was not for some years, that this property, by the general advance in the price of real estate became valuable. Is this *speculation*? When ground was required for a cemetery, Dr. Cronyn offered to the Vestry, at the price which he had paid for it some years before, a most eligible block of 45 acres, close to the town, which had greatly increased in value since he bought it, but on which he declined to receive any advance. Is this the act of *speculator*?

Again, when some of the Church land was sold in order to relieve the debt incurred for the erection of galleries, organ, &c., Dr. Cronyn bought a considerable amount at auction, at a price avowedly beyond its value, to aid in that object; the purchase being in fact a donation to the Church of a considerable sum. Is this, we repeat the act of a speculator, or of one who was disposed to "appropriate to his own use what was meant for the Church?"

6. As to the so called "Theatre Lot." The excitement on this matter arose during Dr. Cronyn's absence in England. On his return the affair was explained in such a satisfactory manner that the

gentleman who originated the charge, expressed the deepest regret at having done so, and in common with all the parties concerned, fully exonerated Dr. Cronyn from blame. From what we have stated, you will at once perceive, that we, who have had the best possible means of watching the career of Dr. Cronyn, cannot agree with you that his "opportunities for usefulness in any sphere in which he may be placed are lessened to a minimum point," or that he "fails to carry with him the respect of those over whom he presides." On the contrary, he has many warmly attached friends, and was the welcome guest of several of his parishioners, when he was separated from his family for several weeks.

The whole history of his connection with this parish, now of a quarter of a century's duration, (during eighteen years of which he received no salary or emolument from his congregation) testifies that he had ever regarded his personal interests as subordinate to those of the Church, in whose cause he has made considerable personal sacrifice.

For Dr. Bethune we entertain very high respect, and in defending Dr. Cronyn from the false charges made against him, we have carefully avoided anything which might be construed into an attack upon the other candidate. Indeed, we cannot but believe that the style of advocacy adopted by some of Dr. Bethune's friends must be very repugnant to his feelings as a Christian and a gentleman.

L. LAWRAZON, }
W. W. STREET, } *Churchwardens.*

London, May 28, 1857.

THE NEW BISHOPRIC AGAIN.

From the Dundas Warden.

In another column our readers will find a communication, which bears the signature of the Churchwardens of London, and which, for reasons different from those urged by the writers, we commend to public attention. *In limine*, however, let us very frankly state our belief, that the production must be affiliated to other hands than those subscribed to it. Its composition, its character, its tone of argument, and—we wish we could add its truthfulness,—are all clerical. But the greater proof is in the second "head," to continue its phraseology—there the word Christian is written "Xtian." It may be the fashion among the London men of business to indulge in this orthography; but we venture to add, if it be so, it is the only place in Canada where such is the case. But setting aside all questions of paternity, we unhesitatingly pronounce it one

of the most disingenuous documents which has ever been written. Do these parties conceive that the Delegates are devoid of sense? Surely such is the case when they tell us that for twenty years Dr. Cronyn has received no emolument from his congregation; for if there be any meaning at all in such words, it must be that the Rector of London has performed his duties gratuitously. Why, the fact is notorious, that, with the exception of Toronto, his Rectory has been the most valuable in the Province; and, if we mistake not, by a provision made by Mr. Baldwin, when Mr. Blake was Solicitor General, Dr. Cronyn was one of those paid an equivalent for the deduction of the stipend allowed by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, when the responsibility was transferred to the Province. On this point we are not certain, but we are positive that, for several years past, Dr. Cronyn has been in the receipt of a very large income out of the Clergy Reserves.

We know Dr. Cronyn only by reputation, and have no personal feelings to guide us in having opposed him. The reason we at all entered into the controversy is, from the very unfair treatment which has been extended to Dr. Bethune. It is, however, some satisfaction to know that the defence which has been made of the Archdeacon, has at all events silenced those who attacked him; for on all sides we see the attempt disclaimed, and those who oppose him now do justice to his learning and pure life. Turning, however, to the document which has led to our comments, it is with some difficulty we believe that its signers were ignorant of the attack on Dr. Bethune by Mr. Brough, of some parish near London. Since this period Mr. Brough is evidently ashamed of his conduct, and has written somewhat in a better spirit. But we put it to any one, if the question, where the Archdeacon gained his degrees, did not amount to a doubt of his deserts to possess such honors. Never was a plainer insinuation of a want of capacity. But since this question has been answered, and it is known that the same college which conferred a degree on Bishop Strachan, gave a diploma to Dr. Bethune, nothing more is now of course said of distinguished colleges. Therefore, for what purpose was it argued that three students seceded from the Cobourg Institution except to awaken doubts of the doctrine which the Archdeacon taught there. They left—here was the fact—why? because they could not subscribe to the teaching. And following this insignificant fact was the assertion that carved imagery was broken by Dr. Bethune's parishioners in the parish church in Cobourg. Dr. Cronyn's friends may call this what they please; we stigmatise it as a cowardly and wanton attack. In a former article we have said that Dr. Cronyn was a party to this libel. We do not mean to divide the responsibility, or to

trace the extent of his participation. He may have inspired it or not—or have given suggestion or not—or have treated what he deemed would be telling points or not. This fine line of division is beyond our ken. But will Dr. Cronyn say that he did not see the attack in manuscript, and give it his cordial support?

Referring, however, to our remarks, that we considered Dr. Cronyn ill-qualified for a higher office, because he has speculated in lands. What does the letter to which we allude prove, if it does not prove the truth of our assertion. We do not deny that the question is a very nice one, whether a clergyman is justified, or not, in entering into speculations, by which provision may be made for his family. But one fact is certain, that public opinion is against his doing so; and that no religious teacher, be he of any denomination, ever did so act, without loosing his hold on public respect. In this position is the Rector of London. We have before us a number of an esteemed contemporary, whose reports are everywhere recognized as being worthy of credit, the *Middlesex Prototype*. It gives an account of a meeting which took place a year ago the last of May. We have there the whole history of the “Theatre Lot.” Dr. Cronyn presided at a meeting where the lot was proposed to be purchased for a School. Now, what are the facts. The lot is purchased by the Doctor’s son in England for £500. In his estimation before the Commission of Enquiry, Dr. Cronyn admitted it to be worth £1000. But after the purchase, a Mr. Hammond offered the owner, a widow, £700. Difficulties occurred on the matter; and Dr. Cronyn paid the £200 additional. Here we have the Chairman of a public meeting secretly purchasing under value, a lot, which he had seen dedicated to a specific purpose, which could not but raise its value. If the facts are wrong, they have remained uncontradicted for twelve months. A “speculator,” say the London Churchwardens, “is a person who makes a practice of buying lands for the purpose of selling them at an advance.” We invite them to apply their axiom to the above facts. But further on, what do we see? Dr. Cronyn purchased land on his arrival, and sold some where a rectory was contemplated. The writers say at much below its value, and on easy terms; but they admit that grumblers objected to the purchase, and that he took back his land. Nor is it denied that the congregation object to the Rector taking possession of the church ground, and that he has leased ground in opposition to their wishes. And, on this subject, we would ask them, will Dr. Cronyn make specific denial, that he did not say that he had the right to build up to the church windows? Let us further follow Dr. Cronyn’s defenders. It is admitted that he purchased from the glebe property when sold in lots; and really,

it is so
We re
such o
it was
for in
in his
the st
Then,
order
mean
specul
examp
sellin
ment t
but th
now, b
the Ch
in the
for a c
Lot, a
preside
And b
a stim
into t
advice
behavi
he sho
yet to
in lan
needed

DR. C
FEE
BIS

SIR
in ano
Paul’s
editoria
respect

ired it or
what he
division
I not see
lered Dr.
culated in
if it does
that the
stified, or
y be made
opinion is
be he of
s hold on
don. We
ose reports
e Middle-
took place
history of
ere the lot
t are the
ngland for
quiry, Dr.
urchase, a
Difficulties
additional.
urchasing
ecific pur-
re wrong,
A "spec-
ho makes
em at an
bove facts.
land on
ed. The
but they
t he took
ject to the
at he has
is subject,
l, that he
windows?
itted that
and really,

it is somewhat *naïve* to read the question "Is this speculation?" We reply unhesitatingly, yes; for what makes men purchase in such cases, but the contingency that it will rise in value? To say it was to aid in paying the debts of the Church, is sheer nonsense, for in such a case everthing was to be gained by regular subscription in his own name. There was the example, a sense of propriety, the stimulus to be given to the good feeling of his congregation. Then, at another sale, Dr. Cronyn was again a large purchaser, in order to meet the expense of an Organ and Gallery. Does all this mean that as Bishop, Dr. Cronyn would recommend his Clergy to speculate at land sales, to become purchasers, for the sake of example, to stimulate the taste of their parishioners for buying and selling, to inculcate a spirit of traffic? Such is certainly the argument to be deduced from what is said. There cannot be a doubt but the system is one under which he has thriven. Dr. Cronyn is now, by all accounts, a very rich man, and it seems that whenever the Church wanted any land there he was to sell it. The right man in the right place. He sold them land for a glebe, sold them land for a cemetery, and he was prepared to sell them land for a School Lot, at least he did his best to get it in his possession, although he presided at the meeting, where it was determined to purchase it. And by the admission of his friends, he was always willing to give a stimulus to the neighbourhood, when Church lots were brought into the market. The first Bishop of Ephesus gives admirable advice as to a Bishop's ideal. He is to be vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, not greedy of filthy lucre, and that he should have a good report of them that are without; but we are yet to learn, that one of his recommendations was to set the example in land purchases, to his congregation, when the Church somewhat needed money.

DR. CRONYN'S CHARACTER CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO HIS ELIGIBILITY FOR THE NEW BISHOPRIC.

To the Editor of the London Free Press.

SIR: It affords me much pleasure in one sense, and much pain in another, to see the names of the two Churchwardens of St. Paul's Church, in this city, at the bottom of a letter, which an editorial from the *Dundas Warden*, on Dr. Cronyn's ministerial character, contrasted with that of Dr. Bethune with regard to their respective claims, to the elevation of the new See, has called forth.

The friends of the Rev. gentleman have at length, and at last, ventured forth, having been reduced to the dire necessity of descending to notice anonymous correspondence. Many, however, evince their surprise, that they have not yet ventured to enter the lists with your humble servant, the "Western Layman," but that they have selected for their opponents those, who far away from the scene of the controversy, they imagine, may not be in as good a position to answer the refined, plausible and glossy statements.

We are proud, however, to say, that through life, we have always been ready with heart and hand to serve a good cause, and therefore with our feeble efforts, we shall endeavor to lay before our readers, a critical analysis as brief as we can, of this redoubtable letter.

We must, however, premise our observations by considering the relations which these two churchwardens hold with regard to their Rector, and then your readers may draw their own conclusions, as to the moral weight which *their* names and *their* brains can give to any endorsement of Dr. Cronyn's ministerial character.

One of them being elected by his Rector, has consequently nothing whatever to say to the congregation, the other chosen by the Vestry, and deservedly esteemed for his amiable qualities, by all who have the pleasure of his acquaintance, is extensively engaged in business of various kinds, which so engross and take up all his time, that he has but little for going about. Consequently, he can know hardly anything of the ministration of the Rector—an observation equally applicable to his brother who spends most of his time in his counting-house.

Do these two churchwardens then pretend to say, that they can make the public believe, that they are the mouth-piece and organ of the parishioners of London, that they represent their wishes, their feelings and their ideas, with regard to their Rector?

Do they think that because they are churchwardens they can smooth and gloss over the discussion and discontent which, to a lamentable extent has, for a length of time, and still reigns supreme, in this much neglected parish, the consequence of the "apathy, hauteur, indifference, and neglect of its Rector?" If so they must indeed calculate largely on the credulity of their readers.

We cannot assent to the oft repeated assertion of Dr. Cronyn's supporters, "that they have not assailed Dr. Bethune's character in a manner to be regretted for their own sakes." Let any one read the sneering and covert letter of the Rev. Mr. Brough to the Rev. Mr. Nelles—and will he not at once see that from *its* date has commenced this controversy? Does it not prove that their "zeal has overcome their discretion," and that the friends of Dr. Cronyn

have affor-
wished an
canvassin
his eligib
ficant self
peaceful
of one w
not for th
it genera

We w
of substa
believe a
endeavor
have tak
word, w
pid comp
them no
truthful
ments.

Every
properly
held for

Can t
they eve
fairs, w
written
seen su

Do th
produ
mainsp
unqui

Is it
kept in
"unqu
greatly
report

Is it
relative
lately
per, a
on the
not p
which

Wa

nd at last,
ity of con-
, however,
enter the
" but that
away from
n as good
ements.
ave always
nd there-
before our
edoubtable
lering the
rd to their
lusions, as
an give to
sequently
chosen by
alities, by
xtensively
and take
. Conse-
on of the
ther who
they can
nd organ
ir wishes,
?
they can
ich, to a
ll reigns
e of the
" If so
readers.
Cronyn's
character
any one
n to the
date has
r "zeal
Cronyn

have afforded those of Dr. Bethune a good opportunity, which long wished and sighed for, they have seized with avidity, *viz*: that of canvassing and contrasting his opponent's character, with regard to his eligibility for the new Bishopric. My poor, miserable, insignificant self, (for are not we all so) would never have left my daily, peaceful occupation, and ventured forth to take up my pen in behalf of one whose character, clerical and moral, defies criticism, were it not for that ill-judged letter. "But has not the blow recoiled, as it generally does, on those who gave it?"

We will now, with much pleasure, proceed to the agreeable task of substantiating the various statements, which the world is told to believe are as false as they are uncalled for. The first which they endeavor to rebut is "the most stormy meetings in the Province have taken place in his Church." I have carefully read, word for word, what they have written on the subject, but my dull and stupid comprehension cannot see that they have said a syllable about them *not* having taken place. The following plain, simple, and truthful facts, do not coincide with their subtle and plausible arguments.

Every one knows that the law orders the Vestry accounts to be properly audited and laid on its table at the usual annual meeting held for that purpose.

Can these two *efficient and self lauded* churchwardens say, that they *ever* placed before the Vestry *any* statement of the church affairs, which *any one* could understand. If so, it must have been written on invisible paper and with invisible ink, as no one has ever seen such a document.

Do they not well know in their own hearts, that the *annual non-production* of this necessary statement has been the *origin* and mainspring of that power, by which they say, "the acts of a few unquiet spirits can give coloring to an accusation of this sort?"

Is it not notorious, that the church accounts have been always kept in the dark, until at last in the Easter of 1855, two of these "unquiet spirits" were appointed unanimously by the Vestry, greatly to the annoyance of these churchwardens, to examine and report on them?

Is it not notorious that the discussion on a portion of their report relative to the church-yard, was the cause of the disgraceful scene lately witnessed? Does not the lamentable and painful loss of temper, and the unclerical and ungentlemanlike language made use of on that memorable occasion, go far to prove that our Rector does not possess that "meek, mild, forgiving and controllable temper, which we all consider as indispensable requisites in a Bishop."

Was not his insulting language the cause of these auditors who

are ranked amongst his most respectable parishioners, absenting themselves from the last two Vestry meetings, which we are told were characterized with "such good feeling and unanimity?"

What gentleman, I should be glad to know, will attend a meeting, when he knows he runs the risk of being insulted, and that by a clergyman, merely because he is endeavoring to protect the rights and interests of those parishioners who have placed confidence in him.

But cannot all this be traced to the "Mammon of unrighteousness?"

The next charge which they have endeavoured to explain away is the following: "It is a matter of notoriety that there have been constant disputes between the Rector and his congregation, to an extent that the secessions from his Church have built up other forms of worship."

The following fact hundreds in London can testify to, viz: That *neglect of pastoral visiting and disgust thereat*, have driven many from the ranks of Episcopacy into those of Dissent which thus, through a negligent, inefficient and unfaithful ministry has gained a rapid ascendancy. I could fill the whole of this page with many instances of this sort. In the bosom of our Church, are the warm and the luke-warm. The former, no matter what the conduct of their minister may be, provided it is not too bad, will never desert their beloved Church, the latter will in many instances follow those who pay their spiritual wants the most attention.

Do they mean to infer then, that the *non-giving up* of the seats proves that the Rector is beloved, is respected, is esteemed? If such a preposterous idea is meant, I am afraid that they are sadly mistaken. That fact is due, not to his ministrations, exhortations, teachings or example, it is due to that love with which the zealous and sound Protestant will always adhere to the Church, the truth of whose doctrines he has been brought up and believes in—though many struggle to go to St. Paul's knowing their Rector's character and antecedents, they do so, because they have nowhere else to go.

Were there *another* Church in London, perhaps *then* the Churchwardens might see how pews would be given up, and free seats vacated.

A great misinformation, we are told, has taken place regarding the right of the Rector of London to the church-yard. Granted that he has a legal right thereto. But does not its assertion in the manner in which it was made, which I myself with many others heard, notwithstanding the Churchwardens' positive assertion to the contrary, for I remember well that the Vestry Churchwarden was *not* present on this occasion, his business in the most inopportune

manner, did not permit him! [We are willing to give the other the benefit of the old adage, "None so deaf as those who don't choose to hear."] Do not, I say, the unsightly buildings which crowd round and disfigure the Church, yielding a slight pecuniary income, sanction the appropriateness of the satirical Juvenal, in his famous quotation : "*Crescit amor nummi, quantum ipsi pecunia crescit.*"

We are glad to hear, that the wishes of the congregation have been at length consulted. We hope that the same condescending, accommodating and conciliating spirit may continue? But why, the late fencing? Is it preparatory to future operations? *Nous Verrons!*

The next grand question which they attempt to refute is the most important of all, as it justly occupies the most prominent position; in the consideration of the qualification of a Bishop, it is that of speculation.

Let us see whether the accusation be true or false—and let us again adhere to facts.

Did not Dr. Cronyn, many years ago, sell to the Vestry, for what it was worth, for a *Rectory*, his late house? Did he not occupy said Rectory for some years? Did he not re-purchase it from the Vestry, returning them exactly what they gave him some time previously for it, although both parties must have known that the said property which belonged to the church had made a corresponding increase in value in the meantime? But where was the necessity for his buying it back at all? or how did the Vestry allow such a transaction? Was the house too far from the scene of his ministerial labours? Was it too small for his family? Was it an unhealthy situation? They say "grumbling caused it!" In those palmy days had not the Rector and the Churchwardens it all their own way? Were they not the Vestry?"—"trio in uno." Did he not, with that intuitive sagacity, which practice alone can strengthen, see that property in London was going to rise? and did he not, sometime afterwards, take advantage of the "golden times," when property was far above its real value, and "Dementia" was securing her victims, sell to speculators for a large sum; which sum if realized for the church would soon have paid off her heavy incumbrances? But how did the speculating "Gemini" work up their prize? was it not by Lottery or Tirage? and did not Dr. Cronyn indirectly lend himself to such a sale? Did not members of his family put down their names for tickets in the said Tirage, and do not "Lotteries" in civilized and religious society, come under the head "Gambling," and have they not lately required for their suppression the interference of the Executive? Does not this delinquent then, savour very much of a love for the "God of Mammon?"

Does it not go far to prove that he does not stand immaculate, that he has fully imbibed of its poison, and in his actions has well personified, that plague spot of the age "Buying, Selling and Speculating?" Is such the conduct, which should mark the selection of a Bishop?

Great stress is laid on his munificence in giving the present Cemetery. It is asked "could such an act be that of a speculator?" The fact is this. The Vestry gave him exactly what he himself paid for it, about what it was worth at the time. It is since the land has come into *their* possession, that its value has increased.

Where then is the force of the argument? Our dull comprehension is at a loss to see it.

His gifts to the galleries, organ, &c., we have never heard of before, but how do they bear on the charge of speculation? We have seen many speculators seized with a sudden fit of generosity.

As to the so-called "Theatre Lot" now justly celebrated as the "Corner Lot," let us consider the operations which have gained for its actors an unenviable notoriety.

Great stress—indeed it is the only plea which is urged in his defence—is laid upon an apology which was given by the person who was the first to bring his conduct in this affair to light. We have yet to learn, however, that an apology hastily, indiscreetly and unadvisedly given, perfectly uncalled for, and totally unnecessary, given too in the heat of the moment, and which report currently says was written in Dr. Cronyn's own house and therefore indirectly under his dictation, and which no man of common sense would ever have written, can be seized and laid hold of as complete evidence towards a substantiation of innocence.

The simple facts of the case are these—my readers may draw their own conclusions. In 1854 the Colonial Church Society, was anxious to obtain a site, with the view of ultimately building thereon a school house and perhaps a church. Their agent, the Rev. Mr. Dillon, hearing that a plot of land situated on the corner of Wellington and North Streets, known as the spot where the old Garrison Theatre used to stand, could be procured, a meeting was summoned in January, 1855. The members met. Dr. Cronyn sat in the chair—one of the Churchwardens was also present as a member of the committee, several resolutions were passed, a site for a school was spoken of, the attention of the Committee was directed to that known as the "Theatre lot," and it was *unanimously* agreed that "every exertion should be made to endeavour to obtain it for the purpose, and the Rev. Mr. Dillon be requested to communicate with Asst. Comy. General Raynor, and the military authorities on the subject." This resolution was *recorded on the*

maculate, s has well and Spe selection ent Ceme- culator?" e himself since the reased. I compre- heard of on? We nerosity. ed as the gained for ed in his the person ght. We discreetly y unneces- report cur- therefore non sense complete may draw ciety, was g thereon Rev. Mr. corner of re the old eeting was r. Cronyn sent as a sed, a site nittee was as unani- deavour to quested to e military led on the

minutes of the meeting, where it now appears. To all this Dr. Cronyn made no objection, every one supposed that he concurred heartily in the laudable and Christian undertaking which would give his parish a well appointed school, and perhaps a church. Soon after this meeting, Dr. Cronyn left for England for the purpose of joining his family.

In a short time after his arrival in that country a letter was received from him by his Churchwarden, in which that functionary was told to congratulate *him* as the fortunate possessor of the "ill-fated lot," which the Churchwarden said he was perfectly justified in securing for *himself*!

To the astonishment of all it was announced, that Dr. Cronyn had purchased the lot in England. Hence arose a suspicion of treachery, the Rev Mr. Dillon and others expressed great indignation and the affair got into the columns of the *Free Press*. On Dr. Cronyn's return to London, another meeting was held, and he endeavoured to explain away his conduct by saying that his son had purchased it. He acknowledged, however, that he knew the *October* previous to the *January* meeting alluded to above, that his son had *intended* to purchase the lot. Still he stated not one word of this fact to the committee, which would have spared Mr. Dillon a vast amount of correspondence and trouble in search of a title afterwards.

Is it not a fact that the *Churchwarden* who sat on the committee was in partnership with two well known gentlemen in the city, celebrated for the extent and success of their speculations? *They* also were very anxious to obtain the "unlucky lot," and one of them was deputed to go to England to purchase it. The sequel is well known. The man of pleasure reversed the old motto, "Business first and pleasure afterwards," the man of business followed it and gained the prize.

Thus we have the Rector and the Churchwarden sitting together members of a Committee, authorizing by their presence and sanctioning by their votes, the Colonial Society's agent, to procure the lot for the erection of a school house. Each, however, unknown to the other, being aware that *other parties* respectively, one a son, and the other a partner, intended to procure said lot for themselves—which they took good care not to mention one word of, thus deceiving one another and the other members of the committee.

When the home question was put to Dr. Cronyn afterwards at a clerical investigation, by a lawyer, why did he not mention this, to the committee at the time? his answer was, "he was not going to make known his affairs to fifteen or sixteen land speculators."

Report says, he afterwards endeavoured to explain away this

statement, by saying that he meant it for the "Churchwarden" thus condemning himself and that gentleman. But were not deep motives at work? Was not the fear of a rival Church the secret mainspring of his anxiety at all hazards to secure and settle for ever the possession of this "much coveted but unfortunate lot." Was he not well aware that if the Church Society possessed a Church in the city, his *own* would soon be forsaken?

Does not a careful consideration of this perfectly true description naturally convey the conclusion, that the best interests of our beloved Church, and morality, were sacrificed at the shrine of private motives—and that too, by *one* who aims at being a Bishop?

The question may be asked, are the Churchwardens warranted in saying that his conduct was justifiable? and was not the *Dundas Warder* correct in saying that "such conduct," however it may have been exonerated by them, in common with other friends, "smacks of an amount of sharp practice painful to observe in a clergyman;" in one who aims at being considered as "the fit and proper person" to occupy that post to which all *should* look with reverence, respect and esteem.

We are next told, that he has many warmly attached friends, and that he was the welcome guest of several of his parishioners, when he was separated from his family for several weeks. The Rector of London most certainly does possess "warmly attached friends." But what forms, we may ask, the wonderful bond of attachment?

It cannot be the "Mammon of unrighteousness!" Are not many of these "warmly attached friends," at this moment speculating with the Episcopal fund?

Amongst the rest, if that treacherous individual "Dame Rumor" speaks aright, is to be included the Rev. gentleman, who by his brain and his hand has lately gained himself such a notoriety in advocating the claims of the Rector of London; one of the Churchwardens also, she says, has thought it a good field for his speculative turn of mind. What warmly attached *disinterested* friend does he possess? We should be glad to know who clings to him, who loves, and who esteems him, because he is a diligent, faithful, efficient, conscientious, pious, and earnest minister of the Gospel?

Are we not justified then in asking, "is such the career which is likely to inspire the minds of the clergy and laity with feelings of reverence, respect, and esteem? Are such the antecedents so well and so generally known throughout his parish, which are likely to create any impression for, add any impetus to, or advance the interests of our beloved church in particular or the cause of religion in general;" and is not the *Dundas Warder* warranted in his conclu-

sion, that
tunities f
are less
the respe
be the la
portant of

THE CH
DR. C

SIR: Churchw
body inti
he could
in its ass
utter wan
A gentle
usiness
himself t

It wou
quiet spi
with the
Churchw
loudly in
Laymen
doubt dr

Are n
spirits"
meeting
seriously

I can
in bette
them fo
Europe,
actually
tribes o

warden" not deep e secret for ever" Was church in
scription our be- f private ?
anted in Dundas it may friends, rve in a e fit and ock with
friends, shioners, s. The attached bond of
Are not t specu-
Rumor" o by his riety in Church- pecula- and does n, who ul, effi- el ?
which ings of so well likely to in- terion in esclus-

sion, that "no matter how eloquent this divine may be, his opportunities for doing good in any sphere in which he may be placed are lessened to a *minimum point*," when he fails to carry with him the respect of those over whom he presides, and that he ought to be the last man in the diocese who should be elected to the important office.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
A WESTERN LAYMAN.

THE CHURCHWARDENS' LETTER IN REFERENCE TO DR. CRONYN'S CHARACTER, ANSWERED.

To the Editor of the London Free Press.

SIR: The communication in your paper of the 1st inst., by the Churchwardens of St. Paul's, has surprised me not a little. Anybody intimate with one of those gentlemen would scarcely believe he could sign a document conceived in such bad taste, so incorrect in its assertions, Jesuitical in its arguments, and showing such an utter want of judgment, as to injure the party he meant to protect. A gentleman by birth and education, of good abilities, and first rate business habits ought to have done better, and not to have allowed himself to be betrayed into signing such a foolish paper.

It would have shown *tact*, as well as taste, when once the "unquiet spirits" were hushed, to let them sleep; but no! not content with the undisputed possession of the Vestry room, these valiant Churchwardens must needs rush out into the street, and bray so loudly in your paper, as to awaken a whole host of angry "Western Laymen," whose forces joined to the "unquiet spirits" will no doubt drive them back to the church again for shelter.

Are not the Churchwardens aware, that one of these "unquiet spirits" is said to hold proof of certain statements made at a Vestry meeting with regard to a lease, which if published would militate seriously against the prospects of their candidate!

I can only wonder at his forbearance. Would it not have been in better taste for these gentlemen to have left Dr. Cronyn to thank them for the hospitality extended to him, while his family was in Europe, instead of publishing it abroad that *they*, and others were actually not without *that* virtue, which even the most barbarous tribes on the face of the earth are imbued with?

Is it not most insulting to Dr. Cronyn to imagine for one moment that it is necessary for his Churchwardens to publish such a statement in order that it *may* be believed "that he was a welcome guest with many of his parishioners?"

The question now before the public is, which is the most fit and proper person to be elected as Bishop, Dr. Bethune or Dr. Cronyn.

In order to choose, it is necessary, that their characters should be known and scrutinized; there ought to be no concealment. And in discussing their merits, it follows, that it is utterly impossible to avoid personalities. We cannot be guided solely by the doctrines they teach, but by the actions and example set by these rivals. On the one side Dr. Bethune is considered a Puseyite, but admitted otherwise to be unexceptionable, on the other side it *has been* proved that Dr. Bethune is not a Puseyite, and that there are many *serious* objections to Dr. Cronyn. His only merits being talent, learning, low church doctrine, and *riches*. His principal faults are, an utter neglect of his congregation, an ungovernable temper, want of candour, and fondness of speculation.

Some of the Churchwardens try to meet these charges. They say, "the minutes of the Vestry books will prove that the attacks of the "unquiet spirits," have generally been made on them and not on the Rector. This is pretty true, for the minutes *do not* record a single instance of the disgraceful scenes which have taken place, and consequently the part taken in them by the Rector is left a blank. This is rather Jesuitical.

But the fact remains, and cannot be blotted out, whether recorded on their minute books or not, that Dr. Cronyn has at church meetings given way to his temper, and made use of statements and language which cannot be justified as compatible with the characteristics of a clergyman, a christian, or a gentleman. With regard to speculation, the churchwardens cite three or four instances in which *they* say Dr. Cronyn's conduct was not that of a speculator. What then? Does this petty statement do away with the notorious fact, patent to every man, woman and child in London, that his *own* and the *church* lands have been speculated in either *directly* by himself, or *indirectly* through the hands of a celebrated firm, to an enormous amount?

Have not this snug little "family compact" worked nicely into one another's hands? And who is the master spirit among them? Let any one who has any doubts in the matter go to the Registry office, and see *to whom* and *by whom* all this property has been sold. Bad as such a state of things is, I must turn to a worse.

Has not Dr. Cronyn failed most lamentably in his duties as a clergyman? The churchwardens wish it to be inferred that for

moment
a state-
welcome

st fit and
Cronyn.
s should
nt. And
ossible to
doctrines
vals. On
admitted
has been
here are
its being
principal
overnable

es. They
he attacks
them and
es *do not*
have taken
Rector is

r recorded
church meet-
ments and
he charac-
with regard
stances in
peculator.
e notorious
, that his
er directly
rated firm,

nicely into
ng them ?
e Registry
been sold.

duties as a
d that for

eighteen years he performed his duties *gratuitously*; this is incorrect; he did *not* perform his duties properly, and he *was* paid for his services; he received his salary from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, he received his fees, he was paid as Military Chaplain, while the troops were stationed here.

In his capacity as Military Chaplain he so far neglected his duty that some commanding officers would only sign the certificate entitling him to his pay in so qualified a manner, that it was evident he did not deserve it—and in Colonel Chester's time, the neglect of the sick in the hospital was so great that it was reported to the commanding officer, and nothing but the breaking up of the military establishment prevented an investigation.

It is notorious that for years he neglected the prisoners in jail, and not until lately, when a salary for £50 a year was granted, has a clergyman of the Church of England attended these unfortunates, now ministered to by *the curate, not the Rector*.

Is it not certain that complaints are general, nay universal, of his inattention to the sick, the afflicted, the poor, and strangers?

How does the Sunday School prosper? Did it not once number about 360 children? Are they not now dwindled down to half the number? What assistance does he give that excellent establishment, the Colonial School? Is he not almost a stranger there? Does he exert himself at all on behalf of an establishment so well calculated to strengthen the Church? Do not some of the members of the Local Committee contemplate withdrawing from it, in consequence of the supineness he has shown for its interests?

And yet in the face of all this knowledge possessed by the churchwardens, they would have *strangers* believe that Dr. Cronyn is the most fit and proper person to be promoted to the dignity and office of a Bishop, and that it is from affection to him and his ministry, St. Paul's church is now well filled. It would be odd indeed if a city of 16,000 inhabitants did not send churchmen enough to fill one House of Prayer, no matter who the preacher. Still if there was another church, it would without doubt be crowded at the expense of St. Paul's—and the motive would then be shown, which has hitherto sustained the only place of worship which a constant member of the Church of England can now attend in London.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

ANOTHER WESTERN LAYMAN.

THE AUDITORS OF ST. PAUL'S AT ISSUE WITH THE
CHURCHWARDEN'S ON THE EPISCOPAL QUALIFICA-
TIONS OF DR. CRONYN.

To the Editor of the London Free Press.

SIR,—As you have published in your columns the letter of the Churchwardens, addressed to the Editor of the *Dundas Warder*, I would request of you the favour to insert the following.

Yours, &c.,

EDWARD ADAMS.

To the Editor of the Dundas Warder.

SIR:—

Messrs Lawrason and Street, the Churchwardens' of St. Paul's Church in this city, having addressed a letter to you, which appears in the columns of the *Free Press* of Monday, for the purpose of endeavouring to refute statements made by you in an article on the qualification of the two "Candidates" for the Bishopric; and in which they characterize as "unquiet spirits," those who have absented themselves during the past two Vestry meetings; I therefore feel called upon publicly to express my reasons for withdrawing from the Vestry; and while doing so, will, with your indulgence, make a few statements, which I can substantiate by evidence if required.

My reason for not attending the last two Vestry meetings:—About twelve months since Dr. Cronyn insulted a committee of which he was chairman, by stating publicly before Archdeacon Bethune, Rev. Mr. Grassett and others, that the reason he had not given the committee some information they were seeking with regard to this *far famed* "corner lot" was that "they were fifteen land speculators, any one of whom would have cut his son out of the purchase which he had gone to England to make." Dr. Cronyn since, through a friend, offered to apologise to me, and has I believe, done so to others. I did not wish the apology to myself, all I required was that a letter should be addressed by Dr. Cronyn to the Archdeacon and Mr. Grassett to the effect that the expression was made hastily, and he was not warranted in using it. I considered this necessary as these Rev. Gentlemen could have no private means of ascertaining our characters, and would naturally feel inclined to place reliance on a statement so publicly made by our Rector. This letter has never been written that I am aware of. I then determined to withdraw from all church meetings in which

Dr. Cronyn induced the East request the Chu but com them an

After books w three o and from stateme meeting duced a and fact to the n Cronyn stateme and the Dr. Cro a most o other g withdre should i remain turing sure pr

The people' denoe ment. the fac solicite jectio also, t with have b lieve, memb office.

The only b of Lo

I c

Dr. Cronyn took a prominent part; subsequently, however, I was induced by a matter in which I was personally concerned to attend the Easter Vestry of 1856. When there I consented at the urgent request of Dr. Cronyn, to act as one of two auditors to examine the Church books, which the Churchwarden informed us were all but complete, and that half-an-hour would be sufficient to close them and furnish a balance.

After *three months' delay*, the Auditors were informed that the books were ready. We gave them a most careful examination, on three occasions, being assisted for several hours by Mr. Street, and from his concurrence felt we were submitting to the Vestry a statement of the church affairs which was indisputable. At the meeting called to receive our report, to our surprise Mr. Street produced another, strangely at variance with ours, containing figures and facts not to be found in his books, and which he had to admit to the meeting he was not aware of until that morning, when he, Dr. Cronyn and Mr. Lawrason had met. Dr. Cronyn also submitted a statement. Some discussion then arose between these gentlemen and the auditors on the propriety of the proceedings; it ended by Dr. Cronyn most unwarrantably attacking my fellow auditor, and in a most scornful manner *comparing his respectability* with that of other gentlemen present. My feelings were so outraged that I then withdrew, fully determined, that nothing or no affair however urgent should induce me again to attend a Vestry meeting while Dr. Cronyn remained Rector of St. Paul's; being convinced that any one venturing to disagree with the Rector and Churchwardens in any measure proposed by them would be liable to insult and annoyance.

The Churchwardens state that the continued re-election of the people's Churchwarden for fourteen years, may be taken as an evidence of the general approval by the congregation of their management. Such an inference, however, cannot fairly be drawn from the facts, for it is well known that the people's churchwarden has solicited his re-election upon personal grounds, stating that his re-election would imply a censure upon his conduct individually, and also, that he made himself personally responsible for debts connected with the Church. And of late years the matters of the Church have become so complicated and apparently inexplicable, that, I, believe, it would be extremely difficult to prevail upon any competent member of the congregation to assume the responsibility of the office.

The simple fact of our requiring nothing but Galleries to our *only* Episcopal Church here, during the time that the population of London has increased fourfold speaks for itself.

I cannot agree with the Churchwardens that you have been great-

ly misinformed respecting the ground on which the Church stands. Evidence can be produced that the first application made to Sir John Colborne for the land was for the purpose of a Church and Church-yard, not for Glebe, and strange as it may appear, I have heard Mr. Street say that the view taken by himself and others was correct, that the Rector was not warranted in claiming it as glebe, and that he would assist us in getting rectified what we considered to be an error in filling up the patent. Searches have been made in the Crown Lands' office for the petition or documents on which this grant was made, but none can be found.

As to land speculations and the definitions of Land Speculator, given by Messrs. Lawrason and Street, these questions could of course be set at rest by a reference to the Registry Office where titles and transactions in lands are registered.

The grumblers who objected to the purchase of Dr. Cronyn's house for a rectory, had, I conceive, good reason for so doing—Church lands contiguous to his house being exchanged with him for it. This, I, as a grumbler, objected to, for I consider that property belonging to a corporation like a Church should be sold by auction. The distance of the house from the church was also a serious objection, as it required the employment of horses and a servant for the conveyance of the minister's family to and from church.

I am not disposed to withhold from Dr. Cronyn any credit he may be entitled to in the purchase of the "Cemetery lot." It might have been better, however, as the Vestry are not acquainted with many of the land transactions connected with the Church, that the Churchwardens had stated what money he had advanced on this lot, and how the payment was made.

The Rector's disinterestedness in purchasing the land at such a high price in order to furnish money for the galleries, organ, &c., is seriously inconsistent with a statement made by the Churchwardens about six weeks since that the property had not decreased in value since the auction.

With regard to the so called "Theatre lot," the statement of the Churchwardens "that all parties concerned fully exonerated Dr. Cronyn from blame;" cannot be borne out by evidence. The subject was brought up at a meeting of the Colonial Church and School Society specially called to hear Dr. Cronyn's explanation of this transaction; the expression of the meeting was so condemnatory of Dr. Cronyn's conduct, that he lost his temper and left the room; a resolution favourable to Dr. Cronyn was, however, carried by a majority of one, after a long discussion (during which the committee had dwindled to eleven.)

From the foregoing, you will see that within fifteen months Dr. Cronyn has on three occasions lost his temper at meetings connected with church matters, and has twice considered it necessary to offer apologies to members of his Church. The churchwardens may deem these "unquiet spirits" to whom the Rector has behaved in this manner; but not being disposed to submit to their dictum; I prefer leaving the public to judge who are the unquiet spirits.

I cannot conclude without expressing my extreme regret at being constrained to address you on this subject; an explanation so public is in every way painful to my feelings, and nothing but the unjustifiable remarks of the Churchwardens upon myself and others would have drawn it from me.

I am Sir,

Your obedient servant,

EDWARD ADAMS.

MR. MONSARRAT'S REPLY TO CERTAIN STATEMENTS
IN THE LETTER OF MR. EDWARD ADAMS, AD-
DRESSED TO THE "DUNDAS WARDER."

To the Editor of the Free Press.

SIR: As you have published Mr. Adams' letter to the "Dundas Warder," I shall feel obliged by your inserting the following answer to some of his statements.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

CHAS. MONSARRAT.

LONDON, June 8, 1857.

To the Editor of the "Dundas Warder."

SIR: In a communication addressed to you by Edward Adams, Esq., on the subject of Dr. Cronyn's qualifications for the Episcopate, I was not a little surprised on reading the following paragraph, viz:—

"With regard to this so called "Theatre lot," the statement of the Churchwardens 'that all parties concerned fully exonerated Dr. Cronyn from blame,' cannot be borne out by evidence. The subject was brought up at a meeting of the Colonial Church and School Society, specially called to hear Dr. Cronyn's explanation of this transaction; the expression of the meeting was so condemnatory of Dr. Cronyn's conduct, that he lost his temper and left the

room ; a resolution favourable to Dr. Cronyn, was, however, carried by a majority of one, after a long discussion, during which the Committee had dwindled to eleven."

Mr. Adams must have a very falacious memory to make a statement so contrary to fact. I beg leave to say, that from the commencement of the Society's operations in London, I have been, and still am Lay-Secretary of the corresponding Committee of the Colonial Church and School Society. I was present at the special meeting of the Committee referred to, held on the 18th December, 1855, and as Secretary carefully watched the proceedings and took down the minutes which are before me, and of which the following is a copy.

"Read extract from the minutes of the Home Committee as follows : 'Resolved that the subject brought under the notice of the Committee, in the minutes, respecting a piece of ground selected by the Corresponding Committee, as a site for new schools, and said to have been purchased meanwhile by the Rector of London, from a lady who had no right to sell, the property being held in trust, be reported to the Rev. Dr. Cronyn, Rector, with a request that he would favour the Committee with explanations. Read a letter of the Rev. Dr. Cronyn, dated 11th October, offering the desired explanations respecting the purchase of half an acre of land, in London, C. W., which the Corresponding Committee had been anxious to gain as a site for new schools. Resolved, that the statement of the Rev. Dr. Cronyn be communicated to the Corresponding Committee in London, C. W., and that in the opinion of this committee, the explanations conveyed in the above statements are perfectly satisfactory.'

After the reading of these extracts from the minutes of the Parent Committee, the Rev. M. Dillon stated :—

"That in conversation with certain friends in Toronto into which he had been drawn, he had made use of strong expressions in reference to Dr. Cronyn, and had even used the term *dishonorable*, but that he *then* thought Dr. Cronyn was the purchaser of the lot in question, which he now perceived was not the case."

"The Hon. G. J. Goodhue enquired what were the charges preferred against Dr. Cronyn, as undoubtedly none appeared in the correspondence of the Lay-Secretary, or in the minutes of this Committee ? A statement indeed is made in the extract of the minutes of the Parent Committee, that the lot had been purchased by the Rector of London, from a lady who had no right to sell, the property being held in trust, but certainly that statement had not emanated from this Committee."

The following is the Resolution which was adopted—

"Resolved that this Society will committe to Dr. Cronyn, and in the nations are onerated to the pu Committee have obta

"Befor

It wa

"Res

I ha

reader

"the

Crony

is ind

ment

it to

resol

M

“Resolved, That the minutes of the Committee of the Parent Society which have been submitted for the consideration of this Committee having been read, we, the Corresponding Committee of London, C.W., wholly disclaim having made any charge against the Rev. Dr. Cronyn with respect to the matters therein mentioned, and in the opinion of this Committee the Rev. Dr. Cronyn’s explanations are considered perfectly satisfactory, and that he is fully exonerated from any charge or imputation of impropriety with respect to the purchase of the said lot by his son Mr. V. Cronyn, and this Committee regret exceedingly that any unjustifiable reports should have obtained circulation on this subject.”

“Before the resolution was put to the meeting, Mr. Elliot expressed his disapproval of it, as it would appear from its tenor, that this Committee were sitting in judgment upon their clergyman, and were called upon to pass sentence upon his conduct, which he emphatically denied. He thought the more dignified course for the “Committee was, to disdain having made any charge against Dr. Cronyn, and in proof to refer to their minutes; as also to express their conviction of the correctness of the conclusion arrived at by the Parent Committee concerning the explanations made by Dr. Cronyn.”

It was accordingly moved in amendment by William Elliot, Esq.—

“Resolved, that this Committee with reference to a communication from the Committee of the Colonial Church Society, dated September 18, 1855, and October 16, 1855, beg to assure the Committee of Colonial Church and School Society, that if it has been supposed that any imputation has been cast upon the conduct of the Rev. Dr. Cronyn, in reference to a plot of ground in this town, the resolutions and proceedings of this Committee do not warrant any such imputation. And this Committee expressly disclaim any disposition upon their part, to create such an impression upon the minds of the members of the Committee of the Colonial Church Society, and this Committee do desire to declare their conviction of the correctness of the conclusion which is expressed in the resolution of the Committee of the Colonial Church Society of October 16, 1855.”

I have now given the minutes, and leave it to every impartial reader to decide whether Mr. Adams is warranted in stating that “the expression of the Committee was condemnatory of Dr. Cronyn.” That Dr. Cronyn “lost his temper,” is not correct. It is indeed true that he expressed his dissatisfaction with the amendment as cold and formal, and then very properly withdrew, leaving it to the Committee themselves to discuss the merits of the two resolutions of which he was the subject.

Mr. Adams in stating that the resolution was adopted “when the

Committee *had dwindled to eleven*," would have his readers draw an inference contrary to truth. Doubtless he has forgotten that the *original* number of the Committee present on that occasion was only *twelve*, and that it had dwindled to eleven before the vote was taken by Hiram Chisholm, Esq., withdrawing—a sincere friend of Dr. Cronyn—and who authorises me to state, that had he remained he would most undoubtedly have voted for the original motion.

That there may be no misunderstanding I beg leave to subjoin a list of the members of the Committee present at that meeting and I challenge Mr. Adams to name any others.

1. Rev. R. Flood; 2. George Taylor; 3. Hon. G. J. Goodhue; 4. William Elliot; 5. Benjamin Bayly; 6. Edward Adams; 7. Frederick Rowland; 8. J. K. Labatt; 9. Hiram Chisholm; 10. J. Hamilton; 11. L. Lawrason; 12. Charles Monsarrat.

Besides the foregoing were the Rev. C. C. Brough who as chairman had only a casting vote, which privilege he had no occasion to exercise; also the Rev. M. M. Dillon and Dr. Cronyn, who from their position could not vote. Messrs. Hurst and Ballantine were also present as visitors but *not* members of the Committee.

Having no desire to engage in a discussion involving private character, I content myself with noticing merely so much of Mr. Adams' letter as refers to matters with which I have had a personal connection, and which contains statements I have had the fullest opportunity of contradicting.

I am Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
CHARLES MONSARRAT.

THE EPISCOPAL CONTROVERSY.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

SIR,—Every one is more or less interested in the controversy which has lately been going on in the columns of your paper, regarding the candidates for the new Bishopric.

We all think, too, that the discussion will, in the end, be productive of much good; as it will point out to those who have deserved the reproofs, which they have no doubt merited, the course which they ought, for the future, to pursue.

I have lately read a letter from Mr. Monsarrat in answer to some statements from Mr. Adams, relative to Dr. Cronyn's conduct with

regard to the purchase of the celebrated "corner lot." According to this letter of Mr. Monserrat's it appeared that Dr. Cronyn was exonerated by the local committee of the Church Colonial Society, in this city, from all impropriety with regard to the purchase of this lot, in consequence of a resolution, which they received from the Parent Committee in England, which states that it exonerated Dr. Cronyn, in consequence of the *statements* which he himself had made, and which was transmitted to London, C. W. Now, many think that this is *ex parte*, and that it is due to the public, in consequence of the position which he now holds—he is a candidate for the Bishopric—that his friends ought to produce a copy of the letter which he wrote to England, in vindication of his conduct. Dr. Cronyn also may have been a party to the composition of this exonerating resolution. To us and many others it now appears, in consequence of what has lately transpired—I allude to the *fact* of his having concealed from the committee which sat in January, 1855, for the purpose of securing this lot for the Colonial Society, the knowledge which he possessed at the time, of the intention of his son who was then in England, and who consequently would be before any one, in making arrangements for its purchase, which, no matter what friends say, does not, and never can bear the mark of either candour, or straightforward manly conduct in any one, much less a Clergyman—it appears that the amendment, moved by Mr. Elliot, in consequence of the knowledge which he possessed of these facts, would have been the proper one for adoption, under the circumstances. It was this amendment, which, no matter what Mr. Monserrat says, excited the ire and indignation of the Rev. Gentleman, and caused him twice to leave the room in a highly excited state, as he well knew that it was tantamount to a censure. Many of the members voted for this amendment.

We would be glad to know, would the Parent Committee have so honorably acquitted him if they had been put in possession of this fact?

As Dr. Cronyn thinks himself a proper person to be a Bishop. I beg to refer my readers to the qualifications which St. Paul in his first epistle to Timothy, 3d chapter 1 to 7th verse, lays down as requisite for that office, amongst the rest he says, that a Bishop ought to be blameless, vigilant, sober, hospitable, not *greedy of filthy lucre*, patient, and one that ruleth well his own house, he should *have a good report of them which are without*, not a brawler, not covetous.

I beg to remain,

Your obedient servant.

SCRUTATOR.